1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA			
2	CHARLESTON DIVISION			
3				
4				
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)			
6	Plaintiff,) Docket No. 9:22-658			
7	vs.) Charleston, SC			
8	RUSSELL LUCIUS LAFFITTE,) Volume VII			
9	Defendant.) DATE: November 18, 2022			
10				
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. GERGEL UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, PRESIDING JURY TRIAL			
12				
13				
14	APPEARANCES:			
15	For the Plaintiffs:			
16	EMILY EVANS LIMEHOUSE			
17	U.S. Attorney's Office 151 Meeting Street, Suite 200			
18	Charleston, SC 29401-2238 843-266-1663			
19	emily.limehouse@usdoj.gov			
20	WINSTON D. HOLLIDAY and KATHLEEN MICHELLE STOUGHTON U.S. Attorney's Office			
21	1441 Main Street, Suite 500 Columbia, SC 29201			
22	803-929-3000 winston.holliday@usdoj.gov			
23	kathleen.stoughton@usdoj.gov			
24	COURT REPORTER: KAREN V. ANDERSEN, RMR, CRR			
25	United States Court Reporter 901 Richland Street Columbia, SC 29201			

1	APPEARANCES:
2	For the Defendant:
3	EDWARD BART DANIEL, MARSHALL AUSTIN, and MATT ABEE Nelson Mullins Riley and Scarborough
4	151 Meeting Street Charleston, SC 29401
5	843-534-4123 bart.daniel@nelsonmullins.com, matt.austin@nelsonmullins.com
6	CHRISTIAN JOSHUA MYERS
7	Nelson Mullins Riley and Scarborough 101 Constitutional Avenue NW, Suite 900
8	Washington, DC 20001 202-689-2001
9	josh.myers@nelsonmullins.com
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2	EXAMINATION	
3	Witness Name	Page
4	NANCY DRAWDY	
5	BY MR. DANIEL	1632
6	BY MS. LIMEHOUSE	1642
7	BY MR. DANIEL	1649
8	TIFFANY PROVENCE	
9	BY MR. AUSTIN	1650
10	BY MR. HOLLIDAY	1685
11	BY MR. AUSTIN	1702
12	RUSSELL LUCIUS LAFFITTE	
13	BY MR. AUSTIN	1715
14	EXHIBITS	
15	Exhibit	Page
16	Court's Exhs. 86, 87, 88	1715
17	Defendant's Exh. 83	1834
18	Defendant's Exh. 89	1842
19	Defendance 5 Exit. 05	1012
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

THE COURT: Are there any matters that either counsel need to bring to the Court's attention, first from the Government?

1.3

2.1

2.4

MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, I do. I think it's pretty brief. Shouldn't be too controversial. Tiffany Provence, I believe, is going to be testifying today, second, I think. She's been designated as an expert by the defense. If they are offering her as an expert in probate matters, I plan to stipulate to that.

The second thing is, though, that she is one of those unusual situations where she's an expert as well as she knows some facts because she was specifically involved. So I actually had that in a case that I presented. We had to bifurcate the witness, or at least be sure that the jury understood that her factual observations are separate and apart from her expert opinions. So I just bring that to the Court's attention. I would ask, however you feel is appropriate to handle that, I would ask you to do that.

MR. AUSTIN: Judge, I think the way they have the questions organized, I think it should be clear. I will try to make sure to be clear to explain the basis for her knowledge and opinion in each situation so that there isn't any confusion.

THE COURT: Well, I think what we will do is, if you

THE COURT: What's the defense response to that?

lay it out that way, and I think if you are -- are you planning to do the facts first and then the expert or the opposite?

MR. AUSTIN: Judge, I am not getting into the facts that much with her. She was not very much involved in the case at all. So I really don't plan on touching on it a whole lot.

THE COURT: Well, you know, it's like a lot of things, it depends, you know, what you need. And to the extent she just looks like an expert, that's one thing. And I think the way to do it, Mr. Holliday, is if you want a special instruction from the Court, ask me for it. Okay? But let's see if we need it.

MR. HOLLIDAY: Okay.

1.3

2.1

2.4

THE COURT: Of course, I have a charge about expert testimony and so forth, and that they've got to use their own judgment, it's not binding on them and all that. But let's just play it by ear. And if we -- if I feel like I need to clarify that her facts are -- she's testified to her facts, and an expert, that she's got two hats, and that they need to be judged, you know, by the standards I will instruct.

I would rather not do it, only because, you know,

I'm kind of getting to things I'm going to charge. And they
haven't heard the charge yet. So I'm always real sensitive
about, you know, in an effort to clarify something, I

```
actually make it more confusing. So let's play it by ear and
 1
     let's see how it goes.
 2
              Ms. Perry, are our jurors here?
 3
              THE COURT DEPUTY: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
              THE COURT: Please bring in the jury.
 5
              (Whereupon, the jury returns to open court at 9:17
 6
 7
     a.m.)
              THE COURT: Please be seated. Good morning.
 8
     Welcome back to the court. I know no one minded a day off.
 9
     And this is hard work. And I appreciate your continuing
10
     close attention.
11
              Defense, call your next witness.
12
              MR. DANIEL: The defense calls Nancy Drawdy. I just
1.3
     saw -- I just was with her.
14
              THE COURT DEPUTY: Please state your full name.
15
              THE WITNESS: Nancy Mae Sutton Drawdy.
16
                       NANCY MAE SUTTON DRAWDY,
17
             having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:
18
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
19
     BY MR. DANIEL:
20
              Ms. Drawdy, you may take your mask off.
2.1
         Ο.
              Thank you.
22
              Be sure to get close to the speaker so that everyone
23
         Q.
     can hear you. Please give the jury an idea of your
2.4
     background.
25
```

- A. I have worked for the bank -- it will be 35 years the 1st of the year.
 - Q. Where did you grow up?

- A. I grew up in a little town called Cottageville.
- 5 Q. Is that in Hampton County?
- 6 A. No, sir, that's Colleton County.
- 7 Q. And what's your educational background?
- A. I have done online courses in banking, high school education. That's pretty much it.
- Q. And how long have you worked at the bank, Palmetto
 State Bank?
- 12 A. It will be -- I will be going on 36 years after the 13 1st of the year.
- Q. And what role did you have when you were first hired 15 35 1/2 years ago, I guess?
- 16 A. I was hired into the loan department.
- Q. Okay. And is that where you've been the past 35
- 19 A. Yes, sir.

years?

- Q. And what are your duties and responsibilities in the loan department?
- 22 A. I'm basically over operations of the in-house loans.
- 23 And there's -- I mean, I have several roles.
- Q. Yeah. And so what happens when a loan officer makes a loan? Could you track that through the loan process for

the jury, just briefly?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

16

17

19

- A. Okay. When a loan officer makes a loan, the loan is approved and made and sent to the loan department where it is booked and put on the system.
- Q. And do you remember when Russell Laffitte first began working at the bank? Had you been there awhile?
- A. Yes, sir, I believe I had. I think Russell has worked there 20-something years. I'm not sure.
 - Q. And have you worked closely with him over the years?
- 10 A. I have.
- 11 Q. And who do you directly report to?
- A. I reported to Mr. Charlie for many years, and I still do. But when Russell became COO and CEO, then I started working very closely, and I was under his supervision.
 - Q. And is Mr. Charlie -- has Mr. Charlie still been active at the bank and coming to work every day?
- 18 A. Yes, he has.
 - Q. Describe your working relationship with Russell Laffitte.
- A. Mine and Russell's relationship is honest. Russell is a very hard-working man. He's very dedicated. He's "dot your I's, cross your T's" kind of guy.
- Q. Did you have an opportunity in the years since he first began working at the bank to observe him develop as a

1 banker?

2

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A. Oh, I absolutely have. I've told him several times that I am so proud of him that he's becoming more and more like his father.
 - Q. What do you mean by that?
- A. His work ethic, just driven. He's very driven, very honest.
 - Q. Very what, I'm sorry?
 - A. Very honest, very driven, very honest.
 - Q. As a community banker, describe his relationship with the Palmetto State Bank customers in the community?
 - A. Oh, his relationship with customers is very professional and personable. If there was somebody who had a flat tire in the parking lot, Russell would be willing to go out and change that tire. Somebody breakdown at the drive-through, he would be willing to push him out of the way until they could get help. Russell is just a very professional but personable type person. We are known as a hometown community bank, neighbors helping neighbors. And that is what the Laffittes are. I mean, they are good people. They are our neighbors helping neighbors.
 - Q. And did you have occasion to have him help you?
- 23 A. Oh, I have, absolutely.
- MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. I think this is improper character evidence at this point.

THE COURT: Yeah, sustained. 1 MR. DANIEL: We will move on. 2 BY MR. DANIEL: 3 Describe the impact of COVID on the bank and the 4 Ο. bank's reaction to COVID. 5 Well, with COVID, there had been a lot of customers 6 7 that couldn't make payments, that had gotten extensions on loans. During the COVID time, the time of COVID, we had a 8 tornado that came through. And Russell and Mr. Charlie both --10 MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. Again, I 11 think we are getting into improper character --12 THE COURT: I think we are getting into specific 1.3 instances. Sustained. 14 BY MR. DANIEL: 15 What was the impact on the community when the Q. 16 tornado hit? 17 It was devastating, very devastating. 18 Please describe the loans not on system and how it 19 Ο. was created, that process, for the jury? 20 Yes. Loans not on system is a general ledger 2.1 account that was created by Russell that would -- it would be 22 an account to kind of clear money orders. So if a loan was 23 not booked right away for some reason, the money order was 2.4

not tied up or held, that it could be cleared in bookkeeping.

And when a loan was made, the customer -- if the funds were disbursed to the customer, then loans not on system would be debited. And when the loan was booked, loans not on system would be credited. And the advance, the debit, would go through to the loan. So it was a balance. It was a wash. So you could have the tracking for the funds.

- Q. You could have -- did you say tracking?
- A. You could track the funds, yes.
- Q. Okay. And when you have a cashier's check, which used to be called a money order, but when you have that, are there any -- is there any paper trail there? Does the bank keep copies?
 - A. Of the money orders?
- 14 Q. Yes.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- 15 A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. How many copies, and what do you do with the copies?
 - A. Okay. So the money order has three sections. There is the actual check that goes to the customer. There is a white copy that -- there's two white copies. One is a customer copy and one is a bank remittance that goes through with the debit. So the original money order is the check that goes to the customer. The second copy is the bank's copy that is cleared, that would go through to loans not on system. And then the other copy would be the customer copy.
 - Q. Okay. Is the LNOS or loans not on system process

- 1 regularly used?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. Okay.
- A. It is.
- Q. At times, how long could it take for a loan to show up, say it's on LNOS, to actually show up in the system
- 7 itself?
- A. Depends. Depends what's going on with the loan.
- 9 | Could take a couple of days to a couple of weeks.
- Q. Now, are you familiar with or have you had occasion to work with state auditors and federal auditors and outside auditing firms that audit the bank?
- A. Yes, sir. I've worked with state and federal examiners, as well as our internal auditors.
- Q. Have they ever found out any major problems with the bank or dealing with Alex Murdaugh?
- A. Not to my knowledge, no. And those accounts have been looked at because they are large accounts.
- 19 Q. In your observation of Russell, did he always work
 20 in the best interest of the bank?
- 21 A. Yes, sir, absolutely, he did.
- 22 Q. Did he always work in good faith?
- A. Yes, sir, he did, and to the best of interest of the bank and the customers of the bank.
- 25 Q. And are you familiar with Alex Murdaugh?

- 1 A. I am familiar with Alex.
 - Q. And his role in the community?
- 3 A. Yes, sir.

4

5

6

- Q. Okay. And describe his sort of loan history or, I guess you would say, banking history with Palmetto State

 Bank?
- A. He has had loans. And he's been a customer of the bank for quite some time. He's had large accounts. But, I mean, we have several customers that have large accounts and that have banked with us. So, I mean, his -- he has had large accounts. He's paid those accounts with interest.

 Sometimes -- or most of the time maybe, he would pay at the end of the year when he would -- when the firm would get their bonuses. But -- did I answer your question?
 - Q. Yes, ma'am. You did.
- 16 A. I'm sorry.
- Q. Did Mr. Murdaugh's income, assets, and his track
 record with the bank justify or support these loans that he
 received?
- 20 MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. I don't 21 think she has specific --
- THE COURT: You need to lay the foundation for her to testify to that.
- MR. DANIEL: Your Honor, I think she's in the loan department.

THE COURT: She's processing. She's not doing the 1 applications and so forth. If she knows, she can testify. 2 But you've got to lay the foundation first. Sustained. 3 BY MR. DANTEL:

- Okay. Now, did the bank ever waive any late fees for Mr. Murdaugh?
- Yes, sir. The post-maturity late charges we waive Α. for probably 99 percent of our customers. The post-maturity late charges is a larger fee. And those fees are pretty much just to get the customer's attention to say you need to come in, contact us, and take care of your account.
- Ο. And so when someone does have a loan go longer or 12 past maturity date, does someone from the bank contact them, 1.3 or how does that work? 14
 - We mail them a maturity notice. And that maturity Α. notice would have that post-maturity late fee on there.
 - And did you meet with the FBI agents when they came Ο. to see you at the bank and describe construction loans versus letter of credit or an unused letter of credit?
 - Α. The FBI?

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- Yes, or SLED, either one. Ο.
- Yes, sir, I met with both of them. And I came to 22 Charleston. They didn't come to the bank. I came to 23 Charleston. 2.4
- Q. Okay. And did you explain to them the difference --25

MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. He's
testifying for her.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say that again.

MS. LIMEHOUSE: He's testifying for her, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, leading. Sustained.

6 BY MR. DANIEL:

5

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

- Q. And what did you explain to them?
- A. On --
- Q. Specifically on the unsecured line of credit and the construction loans.
 - A. Okay. An unsecured line of credit is a signature loan. A line of credit is approved by the bank or by the loan officer or the Board depending on the amount. And a construction loan is the same. But a line of credit, being revolving or nonrevolving, a customer can draw on that line of credit at any time. A revolving line of credit, they can draw on that line of credit and pay back and then draw again. A nonrevolving, then they just draw. And if they pay down, they don't draw over the initial amount.

A construction loan, on the other hand, is a loan that is made for construction of a home or a business. And the construction loan advances have to be approved because of inspections, to make sure that the work is being done.

Q. And describe Mr. Laffitte's last day at the office at the bank.

```
I don't know that I was there on his actual last day
         Α.
1
     at the bank, but I can tell you that when Russell left --
 2
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. She was not
 3
     there.
 4
              THE COURT: She testified she wasn't there.
 5
     sustain that objection. Are you finished?
 6
              MR. DANIEL: Yes, Your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: Very good. Cross-examination.
 8
                            CROSS-EXAMINATION
 9
     BY MS. LIMEHOUSE:
10
              Ms. Drawdy, good to see you again.
11
         Q.
              Good to see you, Emily.
12
         Α.
              So you are a supervisor over consumer loan
1.3
     administration. Is that an accurate representation of your
14
     position within the bank?
15
              Yes, ma'am.
         Α.
16
              And so you testified that you directly report to
17
     both Mr. Charlie, while he was CEO, and then Russell when he
18
     became CEO; is that right?
19
              Yes, ma'am.
20
         Α.
              So Russell is also a loan officer; is that right?
2.1
         Ο.
              Yes, ma'am.
22
              And so when you were working for a loan officer in
23
     processing loan paperwork, you take your direction directly
24
     from the loan officer; is that right?
25
```

- A. Well, for what I do, but now, the loan processors or the girls that print the loans out for him if he's given instructions, that's not me.
 - Q. So, for example, the business purpose statement, that would be on a loan or a line of credit, that information would come from the loan officer, right; not the people in the processing department?
 - A. Correct.

5

6

7

8

10

- Q. So the people in the processing department and who have your position are just taking their direction about that paperwork from the loan officer; is that right?
- 12 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. I'm going to show -- you mentioned a line of credit that we discussed last time we spoke, \$500,000 line of credit. I'm going to talk to you about Government's Exhibit 98.
- MS. LIMEHOUSE: If you will please pull it up, Ms.
- 18 Welsh. And if you could put it side-by-side, actually, with
- 19 | 3 and 5 of Exhibit 98.
- 20 BY MS. LIMEHOUSE:
- 21 Q. Do you recognize this document, Ms. Drawdy?
- 22 A. I do.
- Q. So is this sort of like a screen grab from the bank's internal systems; is that right?
- A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. So it shows everything that is happening with a loan or a line of credit; is that right?
 - A. Yes, ma'am. It's a history of transactions.
 - Q. Okay. And so the document on the left has certain dates on the left-hand side; is that right?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

2.4

- Q. And then the document on the right also has certain dates on the right-hand side; is that right?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And so these dates on the right-hand side and the actions taken by a person on the bank on the right-hand side would correspond with the description of those actions on the left-hand side; is that right?
- 14 A. Ask me that again.
 - Q. Sure. So the type of action taken on a loan, on the right-hand side, would correspond with the description of that action on the left-hand side; is that right?
 - A. Well, let me see. Your description on -- all right.

 You have 2020 on the left side. And you have 2022 on the right side.
- 21 0. Sure.
 - A. 2020, the PSB205410 at the bottom of the page, that is advances and that kind of thing. Now, on the right-hand side, that document is showing, like, an audit review, like if there was a memo post or if the account was changed or

something like that. Those are two different documents.

- Q. So if a memo -- new memo post on a loan, is that how an advance would be documented within this document?
- A. Well, if there was principal advance -- is that what you are asking?
 - Q. Yes. Yes. Go ahead.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- A. If there's a principal advance on that loan, then, yes, you can go out there and do a memo post. If there is a payment, like you can see on the left side, March 31st, 2020, principal payment for \$104,056.51, you can memo post that as well. If this is a credit loan and it's a revolving line of credit, you could go on there -- the memo post just basically says that customer paid on that account or that customer withdrew funds. Which with us having multiple branches, if that customer came to our bank and got a draw on their line of credit loan for \$100,000, then memo posting it makes perfect sense, because you wouldn't want that customer to go to another bank and get that same money. So it basically says, okay, this customer came in and got that money. So that money is not available, is what the memo post would be.
- Q. So this description on the right-hand side that I'm circling the names, would that indicate who was making that action that you are describing --
- A. Yes.
 - Q. -- on that line of credit? So when your name is

here, are you the one actually deciding whether to make that action, or are you taking your direction from the loan officer?

- A. Well, it depends on what it is.
- Q. If an advance is made, for example, on a line of credit --
- A. Okay. If an advance is made on a line of credit that is not a construction loan, then anybody in the loan department can do that advance.
- Q. If a --

4

5

6

7

8

10

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- 11 A. If that loan is approved.
- 12 Q. How about a revolving line of credit?
 - A. Revolving line of credit works the same way. If it's a signature loan, anybody can make that draw and deposit them into the customer's checking account or cut a money order to someone they may be paying for some reason.
 - Q. So the name of the person on the right-hand side would be the person who took that action on that loan; is that right?
 - A. Would be the name of the person who did the change or -- see, what you are looking at on the right-hand side, Emily, is a change to an account, a memo post. I mean, that can be many different things. A change to an account can be an address change. A change to an account could be -- it could be many things.

- Q. Right. So let's talk about a couple of the specifics that are outlined here. I'm going to circle for you July 27th of 2020. And then at the bottom, I'm going to circle for you July 27th of 2020. And it indicates on the right-hand side that a new memo post occurred -- two new memo posts occurred on July 27th; is that right?
 - A. On July 27th? Yes, there were two memo posts.
 - Q. So on the left-hand side, if we look at the corresponding date, that indicates that there was a transfer to the farm to cover overdraft of \$10,000; is that right?
 - A. That's what I see, yes, ma'am.
- Q. And then below that it says there's a transfer to
 Alex's DDA to cover overdraft; is that right?
 - A. That's what it says, yes.
- Q. And then it indicates that that action was taken by
 Russell Laffitte; is that right?
- A. That's what it says, yes, ma'am.
 - Q. This \$500,000 revolving line of credit that you initially spoke to Mr. Daniel about turned into this, excuse me, million-dollar revolving line of credit; is that right?
 - A. I don't see that on here.
- Q. You handle lots of loans in the loan department, right?
- 24 A. I do.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

14

18

19

20

2.1

Q. And you don't have much memory of exactly what

- 1 happened with every single line of credit --
- 2 A. I don't. I don't. But a line of credit, an advance 3 on a line of credit for the funds to be deposited into a
- 4 checking account is not unusual.
- Q. Right. Right. So are you aware that this
 million-dollar line of credit was completely charged off in
- 7 December of 2021?
- A. Yes, I do believe I probably charged it off. I charge off most of the loans.
- Q. Okay. And so you, in your role at the bank, you don't serve on the Board; is that right?
- 12 A. No, ma'am, I do not.
- Q. And you are not a shareholder; is that right?
- 14 A. I'm a shareholder --
- Q. Of the bank? You don't own any shares with the
- 16 bank; is that right?
- 17 A. As far as in my 401K?
- 18 Q. I mean like Board members.
- 19 A. No, ma'am.
- Q. You are not really familiar with any of the facts
- 21 that led to Russell's termination from the bank, because you
- 22 haven't seen the results of any internal investigation; is
- 23 | that right?
- 24 A. I have not.
- MS. LIMEHOUSE: No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anything on redirect? 1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MR. DANIEL: 3 When the customer begins a drawdown on a line of 4 Ο. credit, has that loan already been closed? 5 When a customer does a drawdown? 6 Yes. How does a customer get a line of credit? 7 Ο. Have they already applied for the line of credit and gotten a 8 loan approved? Yes, sir. Α. 10 Ο. So when Ms. Limehouse talks about advances drawn 11 down, if it's "drawing down" or an advance on a line of 12 credit, it's really not an advance because the loan has been 1.3 made? It's just drawing down the line of credit; is that 14 right? 15 They are both basically, I guess you could say, one Α. 16 and the same. It's an advance on the loan, but you are 17 drawing on that line of credit. 18 MR. DANIEL: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. No further 19 questions, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. Any reason the witness 2.1 cannot be excused? 22 MS. LIMEHOUSE: Fine with the Government 23 THE COURT: Very good. You may be excused. 24 you, ma'am. 25

```
THE WITNESS: Do I need to hang around?
 1
              THE COURT: No, you are free to go. You probably
 2
     won't be disappointed with that.
 3
              THE COURT: Government (sic), call your next
 4
     witness.
 5
              MR. AUSTIN: Defense calls Nancy Drawdy.
 6
              THE COURT: No, you just called her.
 7
              MR. AUSTIN: Tiffany Provence, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: I just told the witness she could leave.
 9
     You know?
10
              MR. AUSTIN: I got thrown by "the Government's
11
     witness."
12
              THE COURT DEPUTY: Please state your full name.
1.3
              THE WITNESS: Tiffany Provence.
14
                           TIFFANY PROVENCE,
15
             having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:
16
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
17
18
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
19
20
         Q.
              Good morning, Ms. Provence. If you want to take
     your mask off, you are welcome to.
2.1
              Thank you.
22
              All right. Ms. Provence, the Government has already
23
         Q.
     stipulated to you testifying as an expert witness, but could
24
     you still, please, just give a brief rundown of your
25
```

1 experience in probate law.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

15

16

- A. Sure. I was a probate judge in Dorchester County,
 South Carolina, for a little over a decade. And then since
 that time, which has been approximately 14 years, I've been
 primarily practicing in the areas of probate litigation,
 probate mediation, and serving as a court-appointed
 fiduciary, conservator, special administrator, and PR for the
 probate courts in South Carolina.
- Q. And you said you've been practicing. I don't think we covered, you are an attorney as well?
 - A. I am, yes.
- Q. And so in your practice, do you have occasion to practice within Hampton County?
- 14 A. I have.
 - Q. And that's -- if we are referring to your practice, you primarily practice in the area of probate law; is that right?
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. And do you practice in other parts of the state?
- A. I do. I've practiced in -- at one point, I counted,
 I think it was, 32 of the 46 county probate courts,
- 22 | county-wide in the state.
- Q. Okay. And have you previously been qualified as an expert in the area of probate law?
- 25 A. I have been.

```
So I think you mentioned practicing -- was it 32 of
         Q.
1
     the 46 counties?
 2
              Yes.
 3
         Α.
              How does probate law work --
         Ο.
              THE COURT: First of all, I think we need to
 5
     designate -- are you moving to have her --
 6
              MR. AUSTIN: I'm sorry. I thought we already -- we
 7
     move to designate Ms. Provence as an expert in the area of
 8
     probate law.
              THE COURT: The Government does not object? In what
10
11
     area?
              MR. AUSTIN: Probate law.
12
              THE COURT: Is there objection by the Government?
1.3
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: As I indicated before, we have no
14
     objection to that.
15
              THE COURT: Very good. The witness is recognized as
16
     an expert in probate law. Please continue.
17
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
18
              Is there any standard practice when it comes to
19
     probate law in South Carolina, or are there differences
20
     between the counties?
2.1
              There are vast differences between the counties.
22
              Okay. And how would you explain that to the jury?
23
         Q.
              Well, in South Carolina, our probate judges are
24
     elected. They are elected officials. And so, first of all,
25
```

we have non-attorney probate judges. So they don't have to be lawyers. And then based on the county and, of course, the larger the county, the better pay, is also going to greatly change often the level of qualifications. As well as within a county structure, the larger the county, the larger the budget, the larger the office. So, for example, if I'm practicing here in Charleston County, I mean, I believe there's 12 to 14 clerks at any time, four judges, as opposed to a smaller county, I think the smallest county I practice in would be Allendale, where there's a judge and one clerk.

Q. Okay. And what about Hampton County?

1.3

2.1

- A. I believe Hampton County, the last time I practiced there, was also a judge and one clerk.
- Q. Okay. And have you -- has a significant part of your practice been in Hampton County?
 - A. I wouldn't say significant, no. I probably had maybe 15 cases there throughout my career.
 - Q. Okay. And we've heard a lot about conservatorships and personal representatives from witnesses. But you are an expert. Can you just break down for the jury what's the difference between a conservator and a PR?
 - A. Sure. So the easiest way to separate the two is, a personal representative acts over the estate of someone who's passed away. So to have a personal representative -- and a lot of times people also call these executors or

administrators, but they are serving as a fiduciary or in the best interest of the estate of the person who has passed away.

1.3

2.1

2.4

A conservatorship is different, because a conservatorship the person is serving and managing the assets of someone who is alive. And the reason that we would have conservators is usually the person is a minor or the person might have a disability, often, that is, you know, dementia or Alzheimer's as we age, or it could be a brain injury or other reasons that we can't manage our own assets and, therefore, the court appoints someone to manage our assets for us.

- Q. Okay. And when it comes to conservators, what's the difference between a neutral and an interested conservator?
- A. So, an interested conservator is someone that's related to the person that they are serving. So if I were serving for my spouse, I would be an interested conservator, or my child or my parent, I would be an interested conservator. A neutral conservator is someone like myself that will often be appointed by the court to serve for someone that they are not related to and don't otherwise know.
- Q. Why would you need to bring somebody in that's not related to or doesn't otherwise know the fiduciary?
 - A. Oh, there's tons of reasons. Some good examples

might be that the person doesn't have any qualified family. Maybe they don't have any family at all. Maybe their family members aren't suitable to manage the finances, for whatever reason. To be appointed as a conservator, you have to have -- in most courts, you have to pass a screening to show that you haven't had, for example, check fraud or declared bankruptcy in the past. You have to show that you are qualified to manage someone else's assets. So they might not have anyone in their family that's qualified.

1.3

2.1

There may be a conflict between people who are qualified. So, for example, let's say you have three children, and I know we like to think our children all get along, but sometimes the Court will say, the three of you can't get along on who's going to manage mom or dad's assets, so we are going to appoint a neutral to do that to make sure that one party isn't playing favorites or taking advantage, or whatever the case may be. I could probably come up with 20 examples. But it's not uncommon that we have to resort to a neutral conservator or a neutral personal representative when, you know, there's just not an appropriate person to serve.

- Q. Okay. And how are conservators and PRs paid?
- A. Although they often get confused, they are paid very differently. So personal representatives are paid by statute with, generally the rule is 5 percent -- and I don't want to

get bogged down -- but of the probate assets, not including real estate, unless the real estate is sold. So they are paid by a percentage of the estate that they are managing.

1.3

2.1

2.4

That's a lot different than the way that conservators are paid, which is at the discretion of the court based on a reasonableness standard. So conservators are paid a fee based on what the Court determines to be reasonable. And what's reasonable in one county or one situation might be considered not reasonable in another.

- Q. Okay. And you mentioned 5 percent with regard to the personal representatives fees. Is that a statutory maximum amount that a PR can be made?
- A. It's not a maximum. As a matter of fact, that statute reads that the court can, for extraordinary services, increase that amount. But absent that request, then that's the standard fee that's granted.
- Q. Okay. And would a 5 percent conservator fee be unusually high?
- A. I really think conservator fees are all over the Board. And we talk about differences in counties. There's also differences based on the level of the person who's serving. So a lot of conservators in larger cities, we have some nonprofits that work as conservators, and they might do sliding scales. But I've seen fees higher than 5 percent. I've seen fees lower than 5 percent. So I wouldn't find 5

- percent to be, you know, shocking. But it's just a lot of
 variation based on the county, the judge, the person serving,
 and what's being done.
 - Q. So, ultimately, with regard to conservators, it's up to the judge?
 - A. Uh-huh.

5

6

7

8

12

1.3

14

15

16

- Q. And is it fair to say that a conservator cannot set their own fee?
- A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. And does that have to be documented with an order from the court?
 - A. Well, I want to backstep for one second, because a conservator could set their own fee by saying, I will agree to serve as conservator if you agree to pay me this fee. And if the judge understands that and appoints them, then they've technically set their own fee. Does that make sense?
- 17 Q. Sure.
- 18 A. So now that I backstepped on that, can you repeat
 19 your question for me?
 - O. Do conservators set their own fees?
- 21 A. Yes. So that would be really the only situation.
- 22 And the judge is still responsible for reviewing it for reasonableness.
- Q. And can someone serve as a conservator or PR without actually meeting the beneficiaries?

A. Yes.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. And is that unusual?
 - A. I wouldn't classify it as unusual. I mean, I wouldn't say it happens all of the time, but I certainly have significant cases in my history where I've represented parties as a court-appointed fiduciary, and I have not had the opportunity to meet them.
 - Q. Okay. And what are some examples of situations where that would be typical?
 - A. Well, I try really hard to separate PR from conservatives. So, like, in an estate, I might be serving as a neutral because someone passed away here and all of their family lives in another country. So I wouldn't have the opportunity to actually meet the people that I'm serving.

 I've also served on behalf of people who were incarcerated that I didn't have the opportunity to meet. I've had people -- served people who just lived far, you know, distances away, that there really wasn't any need to meet them.

When you are managing someone's assets, it's not, you know, always necessary that you have a one-on-one personal relationship.

Similar with conservator, I've managed assets for people who have severe brain injuries. So there would not be a reason for me to be interacting with that person, because

they are unable to communicate with me or assist me in that way. Often, when you are serving as a conservator for a minor child, you are really not meeting with and interacting with that minor child. So there are a host of reasons, but I definitely have files where I have not had personal interactions.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. Okay. And you talked about managing assets. What's expected of a conservator or PR when it comes to managing assets?
- A. Well, the fundamental thing is to -- again, they are different.
 - Q. Let's start with whichever one you want.
- A. So I think with a PR, their responsibility is to first -- so think about when someone passes, most of us have dealt with that context. Their first responsibility is to gather the assets. And then their responsibility is to collect and preserve the assets until the estate is ready to be closed. And then their responsibility is to disburse the assets to whomever is the beneficiary of the estate or the beneficiaries of the estate.

It's a little bit different, I would say, in a conservatorship, because your responsibilities there often can be really different whether you are representing, let's say, a minor child versus an incapacitated adult. So, like, a minor child, your responsibility -- the word conservator

stems from the word "conserve." So your responsibility is to conserve the assets for their benefit as they age when they turn 18. Little bit different when you are doing that for an adult, as they are ending life, because you may be doing different strategies, like gifting or working within their estate plan to minimize taxes. So in that situation, you might be doing different things than you would for a minor. But I think the fundamental rule that we try to live by is your responsibility is to, you know, protect the assets and to maintain them for the people who are entitled to them at whatever stage or age they are entitled to receive them.

1.3

2.1

- Q. Okay. So is there any expectation that the conservator or PR grow the funds that they are entrusted with?
- A. So in a PR situation, there really isn't an expectation that they be -- that they grow.

In a conservatorship, specifically for a minor, for example, if you are receiving funds for a child, then there might be an expectation that you get some form of interest or invest the funds or do something so that the funds are, you know, building during the time period where you are sitting to wait for them to come up to the age of majority.

Otherwise, you might just be placing those funds into an account, you know, when someone is three or four years old.

And then for 14 years, they are losing the ability to earn

- 1 interest.
- Q. So you touched on this a little bit. Under South
- 3 | Carolina law, is it allowable for a conservator to loan money
- 4 | from the accounts that they are entrusted with?
- 5 A. It is.
- Q. And where is that allowed under the South Carolina
- 7 probate code?
- 8 A. Do you want me to cite the section, because that's
- 9 dangerous.
- 10 MR. AUSTIN: Pull up Defendant's Exhibit 1, already
- 11 in evidence.
- 12 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- 13 Q. Are you familiar with this statute?
- 14 A. I am, yes.
- Q. And is this what you were talking about when you
- 16 | said statute allows for investments?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18 Q. All right. So let's start at the beginning here.
- 19 You see the date here, it's effective 2019?
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Are you familiar with this statute as it existed
- 22 prior to January 2019?
- 23 A. I am.
- 24 Q. And how does it -- is it similar or is it different?
- 25 | How would you compare the two?

A. There haven't been significant changes over time.

In 2019, we had a major --

1.3

2.1

MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, I hate to interrupt. But rather than relying on the witness to remember what was in the previous statute, I think it would be more helpful if we actually had the previous statute in front of us. This, obviously, is an irrelevant statute for the purposes of this case, this version of the statute. So I would say the objection is best evidence.

THE COURT: Well, I think the question is, does the witness know. She's an expert. If she knows the prior statute and can explain it, fine. You -- on cross, you can point it out if you would like to. So overruled.

- A. So in 2019, this entire section of the code had significant revisions. But this within itself, I actually believe it was renumbered. But for the most part, the powers of a conservator had been consistent since when I started practicing in this area, which would have been '98. There haven't been -- there's been some rewording, but there haven't been significant change to the powers themselves.
- Q. Okay. So going to subparagraph or the first paragraph (a) here. So starting with paragraph (a), where it says: Except as otherwise qualified or limited by court order, is that section similar to the previous version of the statute, or I guess is the entire paragraph similar to the

1 previous statute?

1.3

2.1

- A. I believe so.
- Q. And can you explain what this is, just what this first paragraph is saying?
- A. Sure. So when you are appointed as a conservator, the judge has an opportunity to limit these powers. And you would find those limitations on your appointment, like, it might say -- you know, for example, I served as a limited conservator with someone who had the ability to contribute towards the ideas, but wasn't fully able to participate. And so the judge in that one said, you know, the limitation was, cannot use the powers without first seeking the advice and consent of the ward as necessary. You know, so the court has the ability, when they are appointing someone, to limit these powers if the judge sees fit or if another party asks that they be limited. So that's what a qualification or a limitation by court order would mean.

Also, down the road, if something were to occur that someone disagreed with, they could ask the court, from there forward, limit the conservator's powers.

- Q. Paragraph 1 here says, invest and reinvest funds in the estate as would a trustee.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Is that what you are talking about when you referenced putting funds into an account somewhere and

```
earning interest or investing otherwise?
 1
 2
         Α.
              Correct.
              Okay. And so there's unusual about investing the
 3
         Q.
     funds of a conservatee or the beneficiary?
 4
              MR. HOLLIDAY: Objection.
 5
              THE COURT: What is it?
 6
              MR. HOLLIDAY: He's testifying, Your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: He is testifying. Sustained.
 8
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
              Is there anything inappropriate about investing
10
     funds?
11
              No.
         Α.
12
              MR. AUSTIN: Zoom out, please, and go to the second
1.3
    page and zoom in on 11.
14
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
15
              And are you familiar with this section of the
16
     statute?
17
         Α.
              I am.
18
              And like the other one, is it similar to the
19
     previous version of the statute?
20
              I believe it is, uh-huh.
2.1
              And can you explain what this allows for?
22
              Well, it allows for multiple things, but the
23
     highlighted portion is for the conservator to borrow money to
2.4
     be repaid from the estate assets or otherwise.
25
```

- Q. All right. Again, so is it unusual for a conservator or PR to borrow funds? I guess as a conservator, is it unusual for a conservator to borrow funds?
 - A. It's not unusual.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. If we can zoom out, please. Is that best practice for a conservator?
- Well, again, we have to think about who the conservator is. Right? So in certain courts, I would say if the conservator is borrowing money for their personal use and that could be considered a conflict of interest that the Court would want to review, and in other situations you might be -- you know, a conservator can be a parent borrowing money from their child to make improvements to their own home for that child's disabilities. Right? Like, there's all sorts of situations that you can come up with, a full spectrum of borrowing money. So borrowing money is not unusual. It's just -- really kind of goes back to the initial comment, which is, you know, the duty to the ward, why the money is being borrowed, and if it is in their best interest, if it's earning them interest. If you were borrowing money without paying any interest or borrowing money for -- you know, like a parent borrowing money to purchase a brand-new car and not giving their child any interest, then, you know, the court might have a problem with that. But, in general, borrowing money from the assets of your ward is not unusual.

happens often.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. What's required of a conservator to be filed with probate court when they take loans or make investments?
- A. Well, under the statute, nothing, because it doesn't require court approval. Depending on the county that you are serving in, again, if the judge considered it to be a transaction that fell under a conflict of interest statute, that would be up to that judge as to whether or not you had to file that request. So it's unique to each court as to whether or not you even got to notify the Court that you are borrowing money.
- Q. Okay. And how do loans or investments, the ones we are talking about here, compare to expenditures under the probate code?
- A. Well, so they are completely different. An expenditure is when you are spending money for the benefit of the person who you are serving, right, something that you don't intend to get back. Just like when we have an expense, you know, if I spend my money, then I am not expecting to get it back. If I invest my money -- although sometimes we don't get that back either. But if I invest my money, you know, the expectation is that I'm putting it there to save it and to grow it and to increase it. But in general, an expenditure would be a request to the court that I would like to buy this for my ward, or I need money for attorneys' fees

- for my ward. The list of expenditures is exhaustive, completely different than investing. Just as it is in our own budget. I mean, you have your money that you are saving and investing, and your money that you are expending for your needs.
- Q. Before we talk about some of the specific conservatorships and PRs in this case, have you been involved personally with any of the clients, the personal injury clients of Alex Murdaugh that are involved in this indictment?
 - A. I have been.

2.1

2.4

- Q. Okay. And do you recall which ones?
- A. The primary one I recall was the estate of Donna
 Badger.
 - MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, I know we are making that transition now. I don't know if the Court feels it's appropriate to give an instruction.
 - THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the witness has been recognized as an expert. And when I charge you, we will talk about the testimony of an expert. She's now going to offer some factual information. And that will be held by another standard. And I will talk to you about that in the close. But just important to note now is that she's moving from talking as an expert to talking in terms of her personal knowledge. Please proceed.

- 1 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. So you said you were involved in the Badger case?
- 3 A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall any others?
- A. I believe we did paperwork in the file that led to
- 6 the Plyler case --
- 7 Q. Okay.
- 8 A. -- as well.
- Q. Okay. And do you remember any others?
- 10 A. Not off the top of my head.
- 11 Q. If, while we are covering any of them, if you could
- 12 | for the jury's benefit let them know if you are talking from
- 13 personal experience or just generically as a probate expert.
- 14 I'm going to try my best not to use specific questions, but
- 15 | just in case we bleed over.
- 16 A. Okay.
- MR. AUSTIN: Starting with the Plylers, can we
- 18 | please pull up Government's Exhibit 137.
- 19 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- 20 Q. All right. Do you recognize this form?
- 21 A. The form? Yeah, absolutely.
- 22 | O. Okay. What is this form?
- A. So, this is the statutory court form for seeking the
- 24 appointment of a conservator.
- 25 Q. All right. And who would be responsible for filing

1 this document in probate court?

1.3

2.1

2.4

- A. Any interested party who felt that there was a need for a conservator.
- Q. Okay. And who typically handles that if an attorney is involved?
- A. Generally, in a situation where a settlement is being received, then the attorney who -- an attorney is not allowed to turn over settlement proceeds to a minor if they exceed a certain amount. And, therefore, that attorney, when recognizing that they are going to be in receipt of funds, would be responsible for making sure that a conservator was appointed. Some attorneys might look at the, you know, the family or the client and say, you need to go get a conservator appointed. But the majority of the time, that attorney that's going to be in receipt of those funds would be the one seeking to have a conservator appointed.
- Q. And during your experience working with PMPED, were you familiar with their practices in filing these types of forms?
 - A. I was.
- Q. Can we go to page 2 please. And explain what's going on here in the paragraph 7 and 8.
- A. Sure. So paragraph 7 is simply explaining to the court why you need a conservator. This one states that the natural parent and guardian has a conflict of interest and,

- therefore, is not able to serve as conservator. And No. 8 is telling the Court because of that fact, who you are seeking to have appointed instead of the natural parent or guardian.
 - Q. Okay. Since this is a petition, it says here, I request the appointment of. Who is making that request? Is it Russell Laffitte or is it somebody else?
 - A. Well, on this form, it looks like it's Russell Laffitte. But it really should be the person making the request of the appointment, the petitioner.
- MR. AUSTIN: Okay. Zoom out, please. Could we go
 to the next page.
- 12 | BY MR. AUSTIN:

5

6

7

8

- Q. All right. So the very top here, can you describe for the jury, please, what's going on in this paragraph?
- A. Sure. That's the signature of the person, you know,

 petitioning the Court requesting that they set a time and

 place for the hearing and determining that the party that

 they've nominated is an appropriate party to serve.
 - Q. And that the person nominated is Russell Laffitte?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 Q. But then it's signed by Russell Laffitte as well?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. Is that incorrect?
- 24 A. It is.
- 25 | Q. Can you explain? Well, let me ask you this way. Is

```
this something that comes up in your experience with these
 1
     types of forms?
 2
              Yes.
 3
         Α.
              MR. AUSTIN: And zoom out, please. Can we zoom in
     on the verification portion.
 5
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
 6
              And can you explain this section as well, please?
 7
              This is where the petitioner is verifying that
 8
         Α.
     everything stated on the form is true to the best of their
     knowledge.
10
         Ο.
              And once again, we have Russell Laffitte signing
11
     this. Is that the appropriate place for him to sign?
12
              No, not in my opinion.
         Α.
1.3
              Okay. And can you explain why?
14
              Well, when you are a neutral, an uninterested party,
15
         Α.
     you don't have the knowledge or information to complete that
16
     verification, because that is not -- you are not related to
17
     that person. So you don't have that knowledge. So I
18
     personally don't sign verifications, because I am not
19
     verifying something that I am not aware of. And that would
20
     generally be the responsibility of the petitioner or the
2.1
     person seeking the appointment.
22
              Okay. So should a third-party who is uninvolved in
23
```

MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, objection.

He's

a probate matter --

2.4

```
testifying.
 1
              MR. AUSTIN: I'm asking a question.
 2
              MR. HOLLIDAY: She already said it's improper.
 3
              THE COURT: Sustained. Don't testify. Ask the
 4
     question.
 5
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
 6
              Could a third-party petition to be appointed without
 7
         Q.
     already being involved, being related, or could a neutral
 8
     third-party --
 9
              MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, objection.
10
              THE COURT: It's your witness. Leading. Sustained.
11
              MR. AUSTIN: If we can zoom out. Can we zoom on the
12
     qualifications and statement of acceptance.
1.3
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
14
              All right. Can you explain this section, please.
15
         Q.
              Sure. That's where the person that's being
         Α.
16
     nominated is telling the Court that they do, in fact, agree
17
     to serve in that role and to perform the duties as ordered by
18
     the court.
19
              Okay. So would this be the appropriate place for
20
     Russell Laffitte to sign?
2.1
              Absolutely.
22
         Α.
              MR. AUSTIN: Can we zoom out.
23
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
2.4
              And with these three signatures here, is this
25
         Q.
```

something that you encountered before in other cases?

A. It is, repeatedly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

- Q. And can you explain that, please?
- A lot of attorneys that find themselves needing to Α. have a conservator appointed are not familiar with probate And they don't understand the difference or how the form should work. But, technically, an uninterested party shouldn't be the petitioner, because I have no standing or interest in that case. So I shouldn't be asking the court to appoint me, because -- unless it was my child or my own relative, but I shouldn't be the one petitioning the court to appoint me, because would have an independent interest. So that petition and that verification should really be completed by either a family member or the attorney seeking the appointment. And the party getting appointed should really just be signing the qualification and statement of acceptance.
 - Q. Have you seen this particular petition before?
- A. I believe I have.
 - Q. And what was your interpretation of the fact that this form had three different signatures of Russell on this page?
- MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, now it's a little ambiguous. Right?
- 25 THE COURT: Yeah. I think at this point she would

be testifying personally, not as an expert, if you are asking 1 2 about this specific document. BY MR. AUSTIN: 3 What is your personal interpretation of that? 4 Ο. That the form was done incorrectly and presented to 5 Russell, so he signed all of the blanks. 6 And is that common with these types of forms for 7 Ο. attorneys to make that mistake? 8 It is. Α. Let's go to Government's Exhibit 140, please. Okay. 10 Do you recognize this form? 11 I do. Α. 12 And I'm just focusing now on your opinion as an 1.3 Ο. expert. What are petitions for --14 MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, we were done with the 15 expert part and now we are on the factual part. 16 THE COURT: I think the confusing thing here is you 17 are now going to very specific documents in which she has a 18 role. And it wouldn't be appropriate to be talking as an 19 expert about that. I think she should -- I don't want to 20 confuse the jury. 2.1 MR. AUSTIN: Sure. 22 23 THE COURT: She should testify to things off her

personal knowledge. Clearly, that's what she's basing it on.

MR. AUSTIN: Okay.

24

1 BY MR. AUSTIN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

- Q. So based on your personal knowledge, what are petitions for expenditures like this used for?
- A. When you are notifying the court and/or seeking their approval to spend money on the ward, the person that you are serving.
 - Q. Okay. And does this fall within the investment or loan category from the powers of the conservator you mentioned earlier?
- 10 A. It does not.
- 11 Q. This would be more of an expense, expenditures?
- 12 A. Correct, uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. If we could please pull up Government's

 Exhibit 110. Did you do any work on the Natasha Thomas case?
- 15 A. I don't recall doing any work on that case.
- 16 Q. Okay. And what is this form?
- MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, wait. Wait. I'm sorry
 to interrupt Ms. Provence, actually. But she said she didn't
 do any work on it. She's in the fact witness portion of her
 testimony.
- 21 MR. AUSTIN: I'm just asking if she recognizes the 22 form in general.
- MR. HOLLIDAY: Well, that would be inappropriate back before.
- 25 THE COURT: I don't want to tie us up in knots. Let

- her testify to this, but we are going to keep our on eye on this.
- 3 MR. HOLLIDAY: Thank you.
 - THE WITNESS: This is a document used by some of the courts provided by court administration to keep track of the status of a file.
- 7 MR. AUSTIN: Okay. Go to the next page please.
- 8 And, I'm sorry, keep going to -- next page.
- 9 BY MR. AUSTIN:

5

6

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

- 10 Q. Okay. And what is this document?
- A. This is a document that -- well, this is a document
 where a personal representative can renounce their right to
 serve in an estate, but it's been stricken through and
 changed to create a form for a conservator waiving their -renouncing their rights and nominating someone else to serve
 as conservator.
 - Q. Okay. And so does that mean then that the -- you can see the name Pinckney here at the signature block, Tyrone Pinckney. Does that mean that they are renouncing their rights as conservator in this situation?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Next page, please. And is this the same form you went through earlier in the Plyler case, the petition?
- 24 A. It is.
- 25 Q. All right. If we go two pages forward, please. All

```
And once again, was this form filled out correctly?
     right.
 1
              It was not.
 2
         Α.
              MR. AUSTIN: And could we back up, I'm sorry, two
 3
     pages again.
 4
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
 5
              And you see this section here?
 6
              Uh-huh.
 7
         Α.
              In your experience, who typically fills out this
 8
     portion of the form?
              An interested party or family member that would have
10
     that information or the attorney dealing directly with the
11
     client that might have that in their file.
12
              And when you have served as a conservator, what
         0.
1.3
     obligations do you have to verify the information that's
14
     presented to you on a form like this?
15
         Α.
              I believe that would be based on who is completing
16
     the form. But if an attorney is completing the form and
17
     presenting it to me for my signature, then I wouldn't think I
18
     would have any responsibility to verify that information.
19
     They are the petitioner.
20
              Okay. And do attorneys frequently make mistakes
2.1
     with these forms in that area as well?
22
23
         Α.
              Unfortunately, yes.
              MR. AUSTIN: Can we pull up Government's Exhibit
24
```

109, please. Go to page 9.

```
BY MR. AUSTIN:
 1
 2
              All right. And this is the same form that we've
     reviewed previously? I don't want to belabor the point too
 3
     much.
 4
         Α.
              Correct.
 5
              MR. AUSTIN: Can we go forward two pages, please.
 6
    BY MR. AUSTIN:
 7
              All right. And here we have Russell Laffitte again?
 8
         Q.
              Uh-huh.
         Α.
            And again here?
10
         Q.
             Correct.
         Α.
11
            And is that consistent with the other forms we've
12
         Q.
     seen?
1.3
              It is consistent with the other forms. I'm unsure
14
     who signed under 10, so in this one, it doesn't look to be
15
     three identical signatures.
16
              Okay. I'm going to turn to the Badger case. I
17
         Q.
     believe you said you had some involvement in that one?
18
              I did.
         Α.
19
20
              MR. AUSTIN: And will you please pull up
     Government's Exhibit 218D.
2.1
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
22
         Q. All right. And can you please explain this
23
     document?
2.4
```

This is a document terminating the appointment of

25

Α.

```
Arthur Badger as the personal representative for the estate
 1
 2
     of Donna Badger.
              MR. AUSTIN: Okay. And can we go to E, 218E.
 3
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
 4
              And can you please explain what's going on in this
 5
     document as well?
 6
              Sure. This is where -- this is the resignation of
 7
         Α.
     Arthur Badger as personal representative of the estate of
 8
     Donna Badger. And then below his resignation is the order
     appointing a new personal representative due to his
10
     resignation.
11
              Okay. And we are talking here about Allendale
12
         Q.
     County?
1.3
         Α.
              Correct.
14
         Q.
              And Brenda Bennett?
15
              Correct.
16
         Α.
              Did you ever know Brenda Bennett during your time --
17
         Q.
              I did.
         Α.
18
         Q.
              And she's a probate judge down there?
19
              She was.
20
         Α.
              MR. AUSTIN: If we can go to paragraph D or Exhibit
2.1
     218 -- I'm sorry, F. Excuse me. I misread my writing.
22
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
23
              Okay. And would this verification form, can you
2.4
         Q.
```

please explain this documentation too?

- A. Sure. This is a verification which essentially states that Russell Laffitte is verifying the information.

 And then as attorney for petitioner, it looks as if Alex Murdaugh is signing stating that he believes the settlement is fair and in the best interest of the estate. So I have to assume this wasn't part of the previous document, but was part of the petition for approval of settlement in the estate of Donna Badger.
- Q. Okay. And how do petitions for approval of settlements work?
- A. It depends on the -- whether or not the action has been filed.
- Q. Okay.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- A. So when you bring a lawsuit for someone's wrongful death, if it's not been filed, if a settlement is reached before the action has actually been filed in the court, then you can take that approval for settlement to the probate court. Once it's been filed, then the approval of any settlement has to be handled by the court in which it was filed. And at that time, you then have to notify the probate court of the settlement.
- Q. Okay. Could we please pull up Government's Exhibit 23. All right. Can you please explain what a disbursement sheet is?
- 25 A. Sure. Whenever you settle a case and you take the

- settlement before the judge, it's the responsibility of the 1 2 attorney to demonstrate to the court any of the cost, expenses, attorneys' fees, related to the settlement that's 3 been received, and then to break out after that the receipt 4 of the assets and who's going to be benefitting from the 5 settlement. So our wrongful death code lays out that 6 disbursement sheet and the information that it has to provide 7 the court as part of the petition to have the settlement 8 approved.
- 10 Q. Okay. And who prepares disbursement sheets?
- 11 A. The attorney that's handling the settlement.
- Q. Okay. This disbursement sheet is for Arthur Badger, correct?
- 14 A. Uh-huh.
- MR. AUSTIN: And can we zoom in, please, at the cost expenses portion.
- 17 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. See where it says Russell Laffitte, personal representative fee of \$35,000?
- 20 A. I do.
- Q. Was Russell Laffitte the PR for Arthur Badger?
- 22 A. No, because Arthur Badger was still alive.
- Q. Okay. And who was he PR for?
- 24 A. The estate of Donna Badger.
- Q. And so is it surprising to see this line here giving

personal representative fee to Russell? 1 2 I would say it's unusual. But you often see different costs and expenses based on outside agreements. I 3 wouldn't expect to see it, because this isn't the estate's 4 disbursement sheet. This is Arthur Badger's disbursement 5 sheet. 6 7 Ο. Okay. So we saw earlier where Arthur Badger renounced his status as a conservator? 8 Uh-huh. Α. Or, I'm sorry, as PR. Why would somebody do that in 10 this type of situation? 11 MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, objection. Speculation. 12 THE COURT: Unless she has firsthand knowledge, 1.3 speculating would not be acceptable. I sustain the 14 objection. 15 BY MR. AUSTIN: 16 Do you know why he did, why Arthur Badger renounced 17 his status here? 18 I know why I was told he renounced his status. 19 20 THE COURT: Hearsay. Sustained. Hearsay. MR. AUSTIN: Can we zoom out, please. Can we zoom 2.1 down to the last three lines, please. 22 BY MR. AUSTIN: 23 This top part, can you, please explain that portion 2.4 0. and what it means to you? 25

- A. That means to me that Mr. Badger sought to have his funds that he was receiving placed into a structured settlement so that the funds would be disbursed much like an annuity over a period of time as opposed to receiving the funds at once.
 - Q. And what goes into purchasing an annuity?
- A. Well, I have not purchased many annuities, but usually we rely on an organization that does that for us. Like, so you complete an application. You determine the terms of the structure. You determine, you know, the rate, and how it's going to be paid, at what age it's going to start, how frequently you are going to receive it. So, you know, often people prefer to have that because they ultimately will receive more money. And it also protects the assets if they are receiving any type of benefits or -- I mean, there's 100 reasons that people might not want to receive a lump-sum payment. So when I look at that, I feel that it was Arthur Badger stating that he wanted to have a structured settlement as opposed to receiving the funds in a lump sum.
- 21 MR. AUSTIN: Can we go to the next page.
- 22 BY MR. AUSTIN:

1.3

- Q. So we have Alex Murdaugh and Arthur Badger signing here; is that right?
- 25 A. Correct.

Have

```
So it's your understanding that the law firms are
         Q.
 1
     typically in charge of filling these out?
 2
              Yes.
 3
         Α.
              If Russell was the PR for Donna Badger's estate,
 4
         Ο.
     would he owe Arthur Badger any fiduciary duties?
 5
              MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor --
 6
              THE COURT: Hold on. What's that question?
 7
              MR. AUSTIN: If he is the PR for Donna Badger's
 8
     estate, would he owe Arthur Badger any duties as a fiduciary.
 9
              MR. HOLLIDAY:
                            If she knows.
10
              THE COURT: If she knows.
11
              THE WITNESS: Am I allowed to answer?
12
              THE COURT: You are allowed, yes, ma'am.
1.3
                            Okay. So this gets a little
14
              THE WITNESS:
     complicated, because the attorney for the estate owes a duty
15
     to all of the beneficiaries of that estate, of which Arthur
16
     Badger was also a beneficiary. But that is separate and
17
     unique from owing Arthur Badger a fiduciary duty within his
18
     own settlement or his own, you know, individual action.
19
     they are two different things. And, you know, to the extent
20
     that Arthur Badger was a beneficiary of the estate of Donna
2.1
     Badger and Russell was the PR, then he would owe a fiduciary
22
23
     duty to him with regards to any assets that came into that
     estate.
2.4
```

Okay. Could you explain -- well, excuse me.

25

Q.

```
you reviewed the indictment in this case?
 1
 2
              MR. HOLLIDAY: I think you can ask that question.
     I'm very curious what the next one is going to be.
 3
              THE COURT: Let's hear the answer and then we will
 4
     go to the next question.
 5
              THE WITNESS: I have reviewed it.
 6
              MR. AUSTIN: Well, I will strike that. Beg the
 7
     Court's indulgence.
 8
              THE COURT: Yes.
 9
              MR. AUSTIN: Please answer any questions of Mr.
10
     Holliday.
11
              THE COURT: Cross-examination by the Government.
12
                           CROSS-EXAMINATION
13
     BY MR. HOLLIDAY:
14
              All right. Ms. Provence, good morning.
15
         Q.
            Good morning.
         Α.
16
              I'm Winston Holliday. I'm an Assistant United
17
         Q.
     States Attorney. Okay? Just to briefly go over a few things
18
     that you talked about at the very beginning of your
19
     testimony, you were the probate judge in Dorchester County
20
     for 10 years, right?
2.1
              Correct.
22
         Α.
              Dorchester County, right around here, that's a big
23
24
     county?
         A. At the time I was probate judge, it was not as large
25
```

as it is today. But it's considered a medium-sized county
within the county -- association of counties.

- Q. Fair enough. You've been in private practice now for -- well, since you were a probate judge, which was 2008, I think?
 - A. Correct.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. So even longer --
- A. Correct.
- Q. -- than you were a judge. Just what's the caseload like in most probate offices, both from your experience when you were a Dorchester County probate judge and even more so now when you've been in 32 counties around the state?
- A. Well, it fluctuates. And it's really based on the population of counties. So without sounding too crass, I mean, the number of files you have in a probate court are going to be directly related to the number of people that die there. So, like, Beaufort County might be a similar size as another county, but it has a large retirement community. So they might have a larger number of probate files because they are a retirement community. And so it really -- it just depends. But for the most part, I find that our probate courts are overburdened. Many of them have more files than they could manage. But, you know, it just really depends. It could also fluctuate. You could have years where you have a lot more deaths than others. It just really depends. But

- proportionally, it's related to the size of the population,
 because, presumably, the number of incapacitated and/or
 deceased people is going to be tied directly to the
 population.
 - Q. But being a probate judge is a tough job because, as you mentioned, typically understaffed in those offices as well?
 - A. Correct.

6

7

8

10

11

20

2.1

22

23

- Q. And I believe you were asked under direct that -you obviously do some practicing in Hampton County now,
 right?
- I don't -- it's been a while since -- I believe I Α. 12 have one file currently in Hampton County. But it's been a 1.3 while since I've appeared there. So it's hard within my 14 firm, because we have four attorneys that do exclusively 15 probate, to know if we have an active file in any given 16 But it's been a while since I've appeared in Hampton 17 county. County. But, you know, we regularly administer estates in 18 that county. 19
 - Q. You are familiar enough, though, I think you said that they have one probate judge and one clerk?
 - A. To the best of my knowledge, the last time I was in there, there was one clerk and one judge.
 - Q. Right. That's pretty tight, wouldn't you say?
- 25 A. I would say, yes.

- Q. You talked about this a little bit before, and I don't want to get it wrong, conservators are generally -- they file annual accountings --
 - A. They do.
 - Q. -- for the conservatorships; is that right?
- 6 A. They do.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. And, obviously, these get filed with the probate court, what time of year? Does it matter or just by arrangement?
- A. That would fall back into 46 counties, 46 different ways of doing things. Sometimes it's based on the time.

 Like, if I was appointed in March, then they want my annual accounting every March. Some of them lump you into a quarterly system, so you go that quarter. And other -- there are a few courts that do it annually regardless of when you are appointed. They want it, like, on, you know, January or they want it in April or -- so it just depends. But, you know, it's generally within 12 to 16 months of when you received your appointment.
- Q. And these can be -- the annual reports can be substantial documents; is that right?
- A. They can be substantial or they can be really simple. I mean, it's a court form. Sometimes you have a lot of necessary attachments. And other times just the simple form is enough. That also really depends on the judge and

what they require.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. Right. And in some of these short-staffed counties, it would be difficult for them, every annual report that comes in, to go line by line through each report, verifying transactions and everything that's included in that report; is that right?
 - A. I would -- that is correct, uh-huh.
- Q. And if you were a conservator, then wouldn't you think that the court would not feel the need to scrutinize your work as closely as what you called an interested -- I think interested conservator, somebody who is a family member, for instance?
- A. Yeah, a lot of times we just call them "known" or "interested" or "family."
 - Q. My notes weren't so great on that one.
- A. We just separate them from a third-party, neutral third-party is what I generally am. I would like to believe that I would be subject to less scrutiny, but I will have to say that sometimes judges are equal opportunity when it comes to picking on you. So I won't say that I get less scrutiny simply because of my, you know, history with the court. It really just depends.
- If I could expand on that and say that, really, how much the judge is looking at it is depending on whether or not anybody is complaining or bringing something to their

attention or -- generally, I don't find that judges sit down with stacks of accountings and look for problems.

- Q. Good. Thank you. There was some discussion before on direct -- well, let me ask you this question before we move on from that. Conservators are considered officers of the court; is that right?
- A. That's a tricky one, because if I'm a conservator because of my oath as a lawyer, I'm an officer of the court. They certainly sign an agreement being bound to the jurisdiction of the court. But there's not any procedure where they, like we as attorneys, take an oath to be an officer of the court. I've never seen a court hold them to those rules. So they certainly are bound to the jurisdiction. And if they are an attorney, we are not -- we aren't able to shed that officer-of-the-court role.
 - Q. Right. Even someone who is not an attorney should be dealing with the probate court in an honest and transparent fashion; is that right?
 - A. Should be.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. And probate judges approve disbursements for conservatorships; is that right?
- A. They can. It really just depends on the file. You could also have a financial plan in place where you don't have to approve disbursements. So it really depends on the file.

- Q. Okay. And, occasionally, there are investments made on behalf of a conservatorship; is that right?
 - A. Correct.

1.3

2.1

- Q. And these investments, particularly in the case of minor children, should be relatively secure; is that also true?
- A. Well, the goal is to conserve, so I think that you want them -- but the discretion is up to the court, if the court is requiring approval. And I've seen some courts allow what people might consider moderate-to-high-risk investments, while other courts require you to stay as conservative as, you know, like CDs only. I mean, it's just -- there's a really big variation in that.
- Q. But, generally speaking, there would be a prohibition on self-dealing, wouldn't that be the case?
- A. Well, there's a statute in the probate code which defines transactions which may be considered to have a conflict of interest. And it's not barred, but it is in there that the judge can require that interested parties be noticed and that you have to seek approval. Again, some judges consider certain things a conflict of interest that others would not.
- Q. But you, in your capacity as a conservator, generally speaking, you wouldn't take a loan from the conservatorship, for instance, to do home improvements for

1 | yourself, would you?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. I am not doing that, no.
- Q. You wouldn't take a loan from a conservatorship to put a pool into your house, would you?
 - A. No.
 - Q. And you wouldn't take a loan from the conservatorship to update your countertops at your house either, would you?
 - A. I would not.
 - Q. Because that would be self-dealing, right?
 - A. Well, I mean, professionally, as an attorney, it would be unprofessional. I don't think it would look great on my reputation if I was borrowing money from the person that I was serving to do something personal for myself. It's just -- it's a best practice, I guess I would say. It's not something that my firm would approve for us to do.
 - Q. It's not just attorneys, though, right? I understand what you are saying as attorneys, like definitely. But a conservator taking loans out from a conservatorship for that person's own self-interest, you don't have to be an attorney to know that's not right?
 - A. Well, it just depends on what the interest is and whether or not the interest is also earning interest.
- Q. But the conservatorship exists for the benefit of the conservatee, child or whatever?

A. Exactly.

1.3

2.1

- Q. So you would avoid high-risk investments, for instance, with people who have a chronic history of being overdrawn on their accidents and things of that nature; is that right?
- A. Well, I think you've got to look at what the risk is. I mean, certainly your responsibility is to do a risk assessment on any investment, whether it's a loan or an investment in stocks. I think it is your responsibility to do a risk assessment.
- Q. Certainly, like, unsecured loans and things of that nature are more risky than secured loans; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. While a personal injury case is pending, there's a relationship between the plaintiff's lawyer and the conservator, isn't there, generally?
- A. Well, I'm not sure how to answer that, because if a personal injury case is pending, often a conservator isn't even appointed until there's a settlement amount. And so after the appointment of a conservator -- there's not a straightforward answer to that. The relationship could span different periods of time.
- Q. Okay. But once a conservator is appointed, that conservator is responsible for watching over the money; is that correct?

A. Correct, uh-huh.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. In your experience, when does the relationship with a personal injury attorney end in terms of the conservatorship? Let's say there's a pending case, and there's an attorney who is representing the plaintiff in that case, and the case has been resolved or whatever and the conservator has been appointed, does the plaintiff's lawyer have any interest going forward, or is it now in the hands of the conservator?
- A. Well, it depends on whether or not they are representing or were representing the conservator at the time of their appointment. So, for example, when I seek to have someone appointed, I consider that relationship to be ongoing until they are discharged from their duties as conservator. I don't consider it to be terminated once they are appointed, because my responsibility's ethically to make sure that I'm guiding them through accountings or any questions that they have. So what a personal injury attorney would consider would be hard for me to guess.
- Q. Right. So you are speaking about somebody who does probate work?
- A. And appoints conservators. Like, I am not going to have my client appointed and then just say, well, this relationship is over, I don't owe you any more duties, because if they have questions or concerns, or generally they

- come back to us for help on their annual accountings, they 1 2 come back to us if they need to do certain petitions or to do a financial plan. So, for me, it's really not done until the 3 person is -- the funds are surrendered.
 - Okay. If the lawyer who handled the personal injury case asked the conservator to steal money for the conservator, that would be inappropriate now, wouldn't it?
 - To steal money? Α.
- Yes. Ο.

5

6

7

8

16

17

- Yes, it would be. 10 Α.
- Thank you. And the conservator would not have to 11 Q. follow the lawyer's instructions regardless of the 12 relationship between the two; is that right? If an attorney 1.3 asked a conservator to steal money --14
- Α. Correct. 15
 - -- and in whatever capacity had the case before, the conservator is not bound to follow the lawyer's instructions to steal, is it?
- Α. To steal? 19
- 20 Q. Money.
- No, I would not think they would have to follow the 2.1 advice to steal. 22
- 23 I don't think the question is fairly straightforward. 2.4
- Yeah. To steal money, no, I don't think so. 25

- All right. Because, ultimately, a conservator, as Q. 1 the person conserving the money, has a right to say, no, I am 2 not going to listen to you to steal money, correct? 3 Α. Correct. I want to touch briefly on a few of the things in 5 the Pinckney/Thomas and Badger case. 6
 - MR. HOLLIDAY: If we could go to Exhibit 110, please. And I think we wanted to go to the signature page. That's okay. I don't need the exhibit. I will just go. BY MR. HOLLIDAY:
- Ο. If someone dies during the life of a 11 conservatorship, what should happen? 12
- Who is dying? Α. 1.3
- I'm saying conservatee. Q. 14
- 15 Α. Okay.

8

10

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

- Is that right? Q. 16
- Yeah. So the conservatee or the -- well, we now --Α. we used to call them "wards" and now they call them "AI's," "alleged incapacitated" or "conservatees." So your question is, if the conservatee dies during the period of a conservatorship, what should happen? 2.1
 - Q. Right.
 - Generally, the conservator would protect those assets until the estate is opened. And then they would surrender them to the personal representative, the new

1 fiduciary.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. Okay. Good. And as far as a conservatorship, if someone is 19 years old and not otherwise incapacitated, would there be any need to have a conservator in that instance?
- A. By statute, once you are 18, you are considered age of majority. So without a disability, you wouldn't qualify for a conservatorship.
 - Q. And, generally speaking, conservator fees have to be approved by the probate court; is that right?
 - A. The fees that are being paid for the conservator's service?
- Q. Right. Right.
 - A. Yes, with the caveat that I mentioned earlier, which is there can be agreement at the time that the person is appointed that they are going to receive a fee. And if the judge appoints them with that understanding, then they don't have to continuously seek approval of that fee.
 - Q. Right. But in the absence of some kind of agreement or something like that, the probate court would be the one determining the conservator fee, correct?
 - A. Correct, not determining, but approving.
- Q. Approving, very good. Thank you. I'm going to show you Government's Exhibit 24, please. And this is from the Badger case. Okay?

A. Okay.

1.3

2.1

2.4

MR. HOLLIDAY: And I think we need the second page.

I had my pages mixed up. I apologize.

BY MR. HOLLIDAY:

- Q. So the recovery amount up here, \$4,675,000, there's a wrongful death portion and there's a survival portion. If you would, tell us the difference between the two.
- A. I will gladly do so, but this is usually a three-hour lecture in CLE, so I'm going --
 - Q. I'm sure the jury wouldn't mind three hours at all.
- A. We are going to try to do it in two minutes or less. When someone is killed in an accident or incident, there are two components to being able to recover for them. The first component -- I generally consider survival the first component, because that is money that represents the conscious pain and suffering of the decedent before they pass. And so because it's money owed to them for their conscious pain and suffering, the survival proceeds go into their estate, because it was money owed to them and, therefore, it's part of their estate.

Wrongful death proceeds, on the other hand, are for the loss of the companionship. You know, there's this long list of losses we suffer when someone that we care about is killed. And so that portion is the wrongful death portion. And that goes directly to that person's intestate

beneficiaries, meaning statutorily, it says who receives that. It doesn't matter what their will says, what their estate says. It goes to the people who have suffered the loss. And so in this situation, we are putting the majority of the funds towards the wrongful death, which goes directly to the statutory beneficiaries, as opposed to money towards conscious pain and suffering, which would go towards the estate.

1.3

2.1

- Q. Okay. Very good. So in this one, tell me how the PR fee would be calculated.
- A. Well, generally, PR fees aren't calculated as part of the settlement anyway. They are calculated within the estate, because, for example, what I can tell you by looking at this, is this \$500 would go into the estate. It would be added to the other estate assets. And in the estate, that's where we would normally calculate a PR fee, unless there was some other contractual agreement or agreement by the parties as to how to pay it. So, you know, it happens often, but the circuit court judge really isn't capable of determining a PR fee because they don't have the information that's in the probate court file, which is the total value of the estate.

But if you are asking me what the PR fee would be on this \$500 and wanting me to do math on the fly, then it would be \$50. Right? Is that correct? No? Yeah. So it would be -- no, it would be less than -- the minimum PR fee, by the

- way, is \$50. So, like, no matter how small the estate is, there's a minimum fee payable of \$50. But it would be 5 percent.
 - Q. In this instance, it's \$500?
 - A. Correct. 5 percent of the \$500.
 - Q. You knew Alex Murdaugh before all of this, right?
 - A. I did.

5

6

7

8

10

14

15

16

17

19

20

2.1

- Q. And have you actually -- or at some point, you went into the PMPED law firm and sort of gave them an overview or some training as to how probate law works; is that correct?
- 11 A. I went to --
- Q. Casting no aspersions, by the way. I'm just establishing you are the one who knows this.
 - A. There were a lot of discrepancies within their firm, just like many firms, on how forms were being completed. So I did what I would just call an in-service for their legal assistants or paralegal staff.
- 18 Q. Okay. Very good.
 - A. I went in and spoke with them about, you know, trying to get some uniformity on how they handle their forms and, you know, just kind of basic lessons on working the probate forms.
- Q. Because there were problems with what they were filing?
- 25 A. Well, there wasn't consistency. Right? And it was

- often confusing for us when we're seeing inconsistencies and 1 unsure how they want things handled. So we just felt it was 2 easier to go in. Because it's often support staff that's 3 filling in the forms. So we just went from and tried to 4 create some consistency on how they were going to complete 5 the form, so that we were better able to help them move 6 through the probate court without getting things kicked back 7 from the courts. 8
 - Q. I'm going to show you Government's Exhibit 71. And if you would like, you can take a second to take a peek at this. I know we are going back a way. This is a 2009 e-mail; is that correct?
- 13 A. Yes, it is.
- Q. But it's basically an introductory e-mail; is that correct?
- 16 A. It is.

11

12

20

2.1

22

- Q. And you are being introduced to Russell Laffitte; is that right?
- 19 A. I am.
 - Q. And so when there were questions actually regarding probate of certain issues, not necessarily the entire thing, but you are being introduced to him just in case he had any questions about probate; is that correct?
- A. I would say -- "I have the probate files in our office which we will provide if you and Russell decide to

```
work together. If you do, he will be responsible for your
 1
 2
     fees."
              So I would view this as more of a referral, you
 3
     know, like an introductory potential referral e-mail.
 4
              Right. Ronnie clearly indicating, though, that they
 5
     are out of their element with any kind of probate work with
 6
     their firm; is that right?
 7
              I'm hesitant to say out of their element because it
 8
     could just be trying to separate, you know, the
     responsibilities. There are certainly cases where they
10
     handled that themselves.
11
              But in this instance, again, separating the
12
         0.
     responsibilities, they handled the accident case, you were at
1.3
     least available in case -- if Russell needed to contact you;
14
     is that right?
15
              I was, uh-huh.
         Α.
16
              MR. HOLLIDAY: All right. Thank you very much for
17
     answering my questions.
18
              THE COURT: Okay. Anything on redirect?
19
              BY MR. AUSTIN: Just a couple of questions, Your
20
     Honor.
2.1
              Can we pull Government's Exhibit 71 back up, please.
22
                          REDIRECT EXAMINATION
23
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
2.4
           All right. In that sentence it says, "The estates
25
         Q.
```

were opened so that we could bring wrongful death actions arising from automobile accident." What does that mean to you?

- A. That means that there wasn't -- there weren't really significant estate assets, that the estate -- the reason they opened the estate was so that they could pursue a wrongful death action on behalf of the person who was killed.
- Q. Okay. And is that why they needed somebody to serve, an outside neutral conservator PR to serve in that capacity?
 - A. Correct.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

- Q. And what would be the benefit to a beneficiary of a wrongful death settlement then?
 - A. I'm sorry?
- Q. What would be the benefit to someone here, like where Arthur Badger is being separated from serving as PR?
- MR. HOLLIDAY: Your Honor, objection. Only that it misstates the exhibit. It's not the Badger case.
- MR. AUSTIN: My mistake.
- 20 THE WITNESS: Plyler.
- 21 THE COURT: Plyler matter.
- THE WITNESS: Sure. So it's incredibly common when
 you have more than one person killed in the same accident
 that that creates a conflict of interest for people to serve.
 So meaning when -- often there's a limited amount of money

being offered. And it's being divided between estates. so if there is a conflict of interest because maybe, you know, those -- they have competing interests, then they will often appoint a neutral person, because not only are they not going to personally benefit from which receives the more money, but they also have the ability to be more impartial as far as how those funds are divided. So in a lot of cases, we have PRs who end up with a conflict of interest or have a conflict of interest from the outset where it becomes more suitable to name a neutral person to serve as the plaintiff in those cases. A lot of times, for strategy reasons, plaintiff attorneys like to have neutrals sitting at the table if there's, you know, any type of conflict between the decedents. And sometimes it's living parties that were injured but aren't dead that also beneficiaries of the There's a thousand reasons that this happens. estate. in general, they often appoint neutrals so that they don't have that same conflict.

- Q. I believe you said someone -- PR would serve as plaintiff. Did I hear you correctly?
- A. Correct, uh-huh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. What does that mean for the relationship then between the plaintiff's attorney and the person serving as PR? Is there an attorney-client relationship?
- A. Oh, absolutely, uh-huh.

- Q. And what does that mean then for the person serving as the PR?
 - A. So, for example, if I'm appointed as a neutral PR and there's an accident case going on, then I now stand in the shoes of the estate, the deceased person, as the plaintiff. So even though I'm an attorney, I'm sitting at the table as the plaintiff, and the plaintiff's attorney is my attorney. That's my attorney. And they are representing the estate by and through me as the personal representative. So there is an attorney-client relationship between the personal representative and the plaintiff's attorney. You are their client.
 - Q. Okay. Mr. Holliday asked you about -- he gave you a hypothetical about PR/conservator helping an attorney steal from one of their conservatees --
 - A. Uh-huh.

1.3

- Q. -- PR, one of their fiduciaries. Based on your personal involvement in this case, are you aware of any such request?
- MR. HOLLIDAY: Objection, Your Honor. Objection.

 Hearsay.
- 22 MR. AUSTIN: I'm asking if she's aware.
- THE COURT: The question is, is she aware herself of theft? Is that your question?
- MR. AUSTIN: Yes.

```
THE COURT: She can testify to that.
 1
              MR. HOLLIDAY: Foundation, Your Honor?
 2
              THE COURT: If she has knowledge. You have to lay
 3
    down the foundation. She has the personal knowledge.
 4
              THE WITNESS: I am not aware of any theft.
 5
              MR. AUSTIN: Thank you. No further questions, Your
 6
 7
    Honor.
              THE COURT: Very good. You may step down.
 8
              Is there any need to retain this witness?
              MR. HOLLIDAY: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
10
              THE COURT: Very good. You are free to go.
11
     you. Let's take our morning break, ladies and gentlemen.
12
              (Jury leaves open court at 11:00 a.m.)
1.3
              THE COURT: Please be seated. If the defense feels
14
    comfortable sharing with the Court, just foreclosing how many
15
    more witnesses we have.
16
              MR. DANIEL: I think just one.
17
              THE COURT: One, very good. We will be at ease.
18
             MS. LIMEHOUSE: Your Honor, may I bring up one
19
    matter?
20
2.1
              THE COURT: Certainly may.
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: We've been given some exhibits for
22
    the first time this morning. And we intend to object to
23
    three of the four exhibits. We might want to take that up
2.4
     out of the presence of the jury just to save their time being
25
```

```
in here, if you want to review these.
 1
              THE COURT: Yes, I would. Thank you.
 2
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: The first three we intend to object
 3
     to. The fourth one we do not if adequate foundation is laid.
 4
              (Whereupon, a recess is taken.)
 5
              THE COURT: I've been provided some documents.
 6
 7
     they are separate documents. I'm counting one, two, three,
     four, five separate exhibits. Some of them are multiple
 8
    pages.
              Okay. Ms. Limehouse, let me hear your concerns.
10
              MS. LIMEHOUSE:
                               Yes, Your Honor. One of the
11
    documents is what is purported to be a resignation letter
12
    written by Mr. Russell Laffitte.
1.3
              THE COURT: Let's deal with that first.
14
    defendant's proposed Exhibit 87.
15
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: That's my understanding. Your
16
    Honor, this hearsay, self-serving hearsay that is improper to
17
    be admitted through Mr. Laffitte. I will also say there's
18
    prior sworn testimony that establishes that there was not a
19
    resignation letter. In February of this past year, Mr.
20
    Laffitte was deposed under oath and stated that there was no
2.1
     resignation letter. And so not only is this letter not dated
22
     and is self-serving hearsay, but also contradicts his own
23
    prior sworn testimony.
2.4
25
              THE COURT: Let me hear from the defendant, Mr.
```

1 Austin.

1.3

2.1

2.4

MR. AUSTIN: So the distinction with the resignation that he was you -- resignation letter that Mr. Laffitte was talking about in that bond hearing --

THE COURT: I am not concerned -- I'm concerned that this appears to me to be hearsay. It's a self-serving statement of the defendant. It's hearsay. Now, why is that not -- I mean, the only way an opposing party statement can be used is when it's being used by the opposing party, not by the party that's the self-serving statement. So why is this not that?

MR. AUSTIN: It goes to his state of mind and his intent at the time when he resigned.

THE COURT: He can testify to that and whether -you know, what his state of mind was at that time. I mean,
whether he resigned or didn't resign is largely, in my view,
immaterial whether he did or did not commit the alleged
crimes. But the problem here is it's just, like, basic
Evidence 101, this is self-serving statement. I sustained
the objection as to 87.

What's the next one?

MS. LIMEHOUSE: Next one, I am not positive it's sequential order, but there was a document signed by Mr.

Arthur Badger. Of course, Mr. Badger testified before Your Honor, and possibly could have authenticated that document.

```
But Mr. Laffitte's signature or information is not on that
 1
     document. So he can't properly authenticate it. And it's
 2
 3
    hearsay, so --
              THE COURT: Was it filed in a court?
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: I am not certain that, Your Honor,
 5
    based on the face of that document.
 6
              MR. AUSTIN: That's my understanding, Your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: Show me.
 8
              MR. AUSTIN: Your Honor --
              THE COURT: Your understanding is not good enough.
10
    You've got to tell me -- you've got to file, probate file,
11
    pull it out and show it to me, because that's relevant to
12
     this consideration, was it a filed document.
1.3
              MR. AUSTIN: Our understanding it's in there based
14
    on our discussion with Mr. Laffitte, but we have not been
15
     able to find it in the documents.
16
              THE COURT: Your understanding and can't find it,
17
     that's not good enough. There are obviously exceptions
18
     regarding public records. And there's no marking here
19
20
     indicating that -- there's an objection on authenticity.
     There is a potential exception for public records.
2.1
    been -- it had been represented to me there is a -- that
22
    these probate files are in the record. The record speaks for
23
     itself. You can't say, well, Mr. Laffitte thought it was in
2.4
     the record. That's not good enough. That's what
25
```

```
authentication is. Got to be what it represents itself to
 1
    be. I see nothing on this document. Of course, you have the
 2
    witness here to ask him about it, to ask him.
 3
              But, you know, at this point it's hearsay unless you
 4
     can show me. And I'm open to this if you can demonstrate to
 5
    me in the probate file that it was a public record.
 6
 7
              MR. AUSTIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Keep looking. I'm open to hearing you
 8
    out on that.
              Okay. Let me make a note here. And you could
10
    always call Mr. Badger back for that purpose. Okay? You
11
    could do that if -- but --
12
              MR. AUSTIN: I don't believe he's under subpoena,
1.3
    Your Honor.
14
             MS. LIMEHOUSE: And he's been released.
15
              MR. AUSTIN: It is a critical piece of evidence.
16
              THE COURT: If it's such a critical piece of
17
    evidence, you should have asked him about it.
18
              MR. AUSTIN: We weren't aware of it.
19
              THE COURT: Well, the Rules of Evidence have a
20
    really good reason. And just having things sort of free-form
2.1
     documents and saying, oh, you want to fall within -- this
22
    would be hearsay if it's not -- you haven't given me any
23
    other basis for it not to be hearsay. Easily confirmed or
2.4
    challenged by Mr. Badger himself. But there is an exception,
25
```

```
of course. An exception is for a file of public record.
 1
 2
    And, you know, the file -- I'm told it's in the record, that
     the probate court is in the record but the document is not.
 3
     If that changes, I'm glad to reconsider. At this point, I
 4
     sustain the objection.
 5
              What's the next one?
 6
 7
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Next one, Your Honor, is a letter
     from Mr. Jan Malinowski. Again, he testified before Your
 8
     Honor last week. I don't believe Mr. Laffitte can
     authenticate that letter written by Mr. Jan Malinowski.
10
              THE COURT: Did he receive the letter?
11
              MR. AUSTIN: Yes, Your Honor.
12
              MS. LIMEHOUSE:
                             We've just seen it this morning.
1.3
                                                                 So
    we haven't had an opportunity to ask any of our witnesses
14
     about this either.
15
              THE COURT: What's your objection to it?
16
              MS. LIMEHOUSE:
                              It's hearsay, Your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: What's it offered -- what's the purpose?
18
              MR. AUSTIN: It's a business record. And it shows
19
    that Mr. Laffitte is trying to pay back fees to the bank,
20
     trying to make -- trying to avoid the bank suffer any
2.1
     consequences or limit the consequences it suffered from any
22
    negligent actions.
23
              THE COURT: Let me understand what he's trying to
2.4
     do. He encloses personal checks for 15,000. And this is Mr.
25
```

```
Malinowski writing the defendant: Enclosed please find your
 1
    personal checks. I am informed they represent conservator
 2
     fees for Natasha Thomas and Hakeem Pinckney. I am returning
 3
     the items to you. As you know, the bank was not a
 4
     conservator in either case, nor did it perform any service in
 5
     either case. Consequently, the bank did not earn or seek any
 6
 7
     fee.
              You want that document in?
 8
              MR. AUSTIN: Yes, Your Honor. We think it goes to
 9
    Mr. Laffitte's state of mind at the time.
10
              THE COURT: No. No. This is March 14, 2022.
                                                             It's
11
    not contemporaneous. It's not a state-of-mind document.
12
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: I think there's also issues with
1.3
     relevance, Your Honor, a letter from March --
14
              THE COURT: Also jury confusion. You know, you
15
     can't -- I don't want to create an analogy here, but you
16
     can't commit a crime and then offer to give the money back
17
    after later. I mean, that's not -- it doesn't go to the
18
     state of mind at the time you committed the act. Again, if
19
     it's such a critical document, you could have asked Mr.
20
    Malinowski about it as the -- but I think there are real
2.1
     issues here about relevance and jury confusion, 403, because
22
    my understanding, and you can correct me on this, Mr. Austin,
23
     this is all after the fact of the alleged crimes here.
2.4
```

MR. AUSTIN: There's been a lot of testimony, Your

Honor, about Mr. Laffitte's acceptance of responsibility. Do you recall the November e-mail chains that talked about him saying, we converted, and people asking if he was responsible from the Board, and he said --

1.3

2.1

THE COURT: That's fine. You can question him about it. But now after the fact, coming and saying, I want to give the money back, that's not relevant. And it's kind of inviting -- you can't -- you and I both know, Mr. Austin, you can't commit a crime and be exculpated after you got caught you gave the money back. Right? There would never be a bank robbery charge. Right? So that can't be the basis for this. Now, if you can establish to me some other better relevance that might be -- doesn't seem relevant to me. And it's misleading to the jury. And I think it kind of invites nullification because it's not a proper defense.

MR. AUSTIN: Your Honor, he was accused of keeping the conservatorship money. And he also was trying to repay fees back in the fall of 2021 as well. And so --

THE COURT: Well, if he -- if you put it during the relevant time, I will rule on that. But this is March 14, '22. That's outside the time. And I sustain that objection. Okay. That's 86.

Okay. And then I have Exhibit 83, which are two checks in 2021, November of '21, to Palmetto State Bank, PR fee, one-half in settlement. I'm not sure I understand this,

```
these checks. This is a check and a deposit slip.
 1
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: My expectation, and I don't know
 2
     this, but my expectation is that they are going to argue that
 3
     that represents half of the $35,000 PR fee that Mr. Laffitte
 4
     took from Arthur Badger.
 5
              THE COURT: Well, y'all said he -- you've asked him
 6
 7
    multiple times, did that represent half the fee, and if he,
     you know -- at the time he attempted to pay it. That would,
 8
     seems to me at least, would be potentially relevant to the
     case.
10
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: We have no objection as long as --
11
              THE COURT: I think 83 is a proper document. You
12
     know, jury is going to decide the significance of it and all
1.3
     that, but I think it's a proper document.
14
              MR. AUSTIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: So let me just -- reviewing is, I
16
     sustain the Government's objection regarding defendant's
17
    proposed Exhibits 86, 87 and 88. And I -- there's not an
18
     objection to 83. Did I accurately state that?
19
20
              MS. LIMEHOUSE:
                              That's correct, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: And we will mark these just so they will
2.1
    be in the record what these were.
22
              MR. AUSTIN: Your Honor, is 83 in evidence now?
23
              THE COURT: You are going to have to put it in,
24
    unless y'all stipulate or something.
25
```

```
MR. AUSTIN: I wasn't sure if there was a
 1
 2
     stipulation.
              THE COURT: I don't understand there to be. If
 3
     y'all work it out, that's fine with me. Okay.
 4
              Is our jury ready, Ms. Crystal? Let's bring them
 5
     in.
 6
              (Court's Exhibit 86, 87 and 88 are marked for
 7
     identification.)
 8
              (Whereupon, the jury returns to open court at 11:26
 9
     a.m.)
10
              THE COURT: Please be seated.
11
              Government, call your next witness.
12
              MR. AUSTIN: The defense calls Russell Laffitte.
1.3
              THE COURT DEPUTY: Please state your full name.
14
              THE WITNESS: Russell Lucius Laffitte.
15
                        RUSSELL LUCIUS LAFFITTE,
16
             having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:
17
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
18
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
19
              Good morning, Mr. Laffitte. Can you tell the jury a
20
     little bit about yourself. Where were you born and where did
2.1
     you grow up?
22
              I was born and raised right in Hampton County.
23
     Always wanted to live right there in Hampton County. I went
2.4
     to -- graduated from Patrick Henry Academy in Estill, South
25
```

Carolina. Then I went -- well, I took a break between high school and college, farmed for five years. Then I went to Newberry College. Graduated with a business degree in 1997.

And immediately came back to work at Palmetto State Bank.

1.3

2.1

- Q. Okay. So you took a little break. Did you set out to become a banker when you graduated high school?
- A. I had no intentions of ever being a banker. I like the outdoors. Always liked hunting and doing things, farming. I like being outdoors. And so I didn't want to be stuck in the office. And my father had asked me to come back from 1997 when I was graduating. And I decided to try it. And I just fell in love with it. And I really, really enjoyed it.
 - Q. And what do you like in particular about banking?
- A. I enjoyed helping people. There's nothing like, you know, helping somebody start their business or save their business by loaning them money when, you know, things are going wrong, especially as they were in COVID, when they buy their first car, or help them pay for their child to go to college or something, anything, buy the house. I mean, it's a wonderful feeling to get to help people in that manner.
- Q. Okay. And since you came back from college, have you lived in Hampton your entire adult life?
- A. I have. Technically, in Varnville but Varnville and Hampton are side-by-side towns.

Q. Okay. And can you just trace your work history at Palmetto State and explain what different roles you filled?

1.3

2.1

- A. Well, as was testified earlier in this trial, I was the gofer when I started back in '97. You know, I never worked in the bank, not a day in my life, other than to move files or haul stuff to the dump or something along those lines. So when I first started, just like everybody, you know, we go through the teller line just to learn the basics. No, they didn't think I was going to be a teller my whole life. And it's a good thing, because I am not really that good at it. So we went through the teller line. And I moved through different spots. But along that same -- around that same time that I came, one of our loan officers quit and moved to another bank. So I was sort of thrust into loans, consumer lending fairly quickly.
 - Q. And would you say that's your sweet spot in banking?
 - A. I would say commercial lending. As I developed throughout the years as a lender, you know, you just don't let people start out. I mean, there's a lot to look at. And so much of it, especially in community banks, as you heard over and over, it's relationship banking. You have to know the people, know their business. And my sort of niche was the timber industry and the agricultural. I understand the timber industry, whether it be logging, purchasing, and buying and selling timber, or even such as the saw mills in

our area, which is -- just so you know, timber is our number one industry in Hampton County. So you need to learn it if you want to be a banker in Hampton County. And so that's what I sort of focused on. And that was where the majority of my loans were, with either purchasing land, timber-producing properties, farms, purchasing the heavy equipment for the loggers themselves or production loans for them.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. Okay. And tell me about your own family. We've heard from your dad, your sister, and your brother. But what about your family; how many children do you have?
- A. I have two children. And, you know, I've got to give my wife credit. She's done a great job with them. I hope I've helped some. You know, back in January when I was fired, it made me -- chokes me up to think about this, about how much of my life, of my children's lives that I threw away, that I should have spent more time with them. And I wish I had. I wished I hadn't worked all the time, because I will tell you, I'm a workaholic. I love to work, always have, and still work a lot. But when something of this magnitude happens, it totally changes your priorities. And you see things through a different set of eyes. So, no, I am not glad to be sitting here, but I am glad that I've gotten those priorities straight now.
 - Q. All right. And tell me about your community

involvement in Hampton.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

We're a community bank. Palmetto State Bank is a community bank. We stress community involvement, whether -and I think people need to be involved in the community regardless of whether you are a banker. I mean, that's part of being in the community. It makes your community a better person -- a better place. I've started out in the Rotary Club. I was in the Rotary Club for 20-something years. not sure how long, a long time. That was a good club. And also we did -- I did Little League. I coached baseball, which is sort of ironic, because I never played baseball. But I helped -- let's qualify Little League, T-ball. It was T-ball. I was the person that directed them which way to And, you know, I also did the concession stands for our Little League football. I ran all the concession stands helping them. You know, we would get there -- if it was Saturday games, games start at three o'clock, I would be there about 7:30 and we would get going all day long.

I was also involved with our Economic Development

Commission. And I was -- I had resigned from it because I

did not realize you couldn't be on two state -- quasi-state

county commissions. I was on our Hampton County Disabilities

and Special Needs Board. And that was first. And then I got

on the Economic Development Commission. And I was notified

by the County that I couldn't be on both and to pick one. I

- think they thought I was going to take the Economic

 Development Board, being a banker. But I chose Disability

 and Special Needs. It was just a special -- you know, to be

 able to help those individuals, to sort of shape the kind of

 services that they will get in the county, it meant a lot to

 me. So I did that. I was also involved with my church. I

 did a lot.
 - Q. And we talked about your kids. And your wife, Susie, what does she do for a living?
 - A. You really are going to put me on the spot now.

 She's a teacher, sort of.
 - Q. Can you explain that?

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. I'm trying to think of the exact term. Reading recovery, she helps -- I know exactly what she does, but I'm not sure what they call her. Reading recovery, she helps students that don't read up to grade level, get up to grade level. She pulls them out of classroom and puts them in small groups and helps get them up to grade level.
- Q. Okay. Has she always lived in Hampton or the surrounding areas?
- A. She took about a three-year detour and went to Mississippi, but other than that, she's been there.
- Q. All right. We've obviously heard a lot about Alex Murdaugh in this. Can you just tell the jury, please, about your relationship with him growing up and professionally?

Alex -- I don't know if y'all realize this, but I Α. know y'all realize we grew up next-door to each other, literally across the street. And he is my father's godson and I'm his father's godson. So, you know, we have tight ties. I never was really close to him. I was close to his younger brother, John Marvin, which you all met the other day. Alex is three or four years older than me. I think three years older, to be exact. So when I was coming in to getting big enough to play basketball or football and all, you know, they were a lot older. You know how the growth differences are in kids. And I never went -- like, if I was coming in freshman in high school, he was a senior. So we never really did a lot; whereas, with his brother, I was the same age. However, being in the same town, we know each other.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

And he was a partner at the law firm, PMPED. And so, obviously, I knew him since they are our largest private customer in Hampton County, and probably might be in the whole bank, bank-wide. So I did know him from there. And we had -- you know, I banked him. I was his banker or whatever you want to call it. You know, one of my things, I catered to the law firm. You know, they were good clients. And I wanted to cater to them and make sure that they stayed good clients. We kept a lot of loans, a tremendous amount of deposits. I actually know that, but I don't know if I can

say that in public or -- I don't think it's really necessary. Y'all understand, they had a lot of loans and a lot of deposits and we wanted to keep then. So, yes, he was one of my clients, along with many, many of the other attorneys. It wasn't just Alex.

1.3

2.1

- Q. And were you the only person at Palmetto State that would help him with banking needs?
- A. He would sometimes come to my father because that's where it started. He started banking with my father, I'm assuming. And, you know, Chad Westendorf would help him sometimes, depending on what he was needing. If he wanted to open an account, he definitely was not going to talk to me, he was going to talk to one of our customer service people, because I just wouldn't even begin to know how to do that. But, you know, we all would help him if they needed it. But, yes, primarily, I would say I was definitely his primary banker.
- Q. Okay. And can you tell the jury a little bit about the Murdaugh family and their -- the way they were viewed in Hampton County?
- A. Well, the Murdaugh family in Hampton County growing up, when I say "growing up," when I was young, their granddad, Mr. Buster Murdaugh, he was the solicitor. And as I grew up, Mr. Randolph III was the solicitor, Mr. Randolph Murdaugh III was the solicitor, and I don't know how else to

say it, they were the law in Hampton County. I mean, they were very influential, is an understatement when it comes to -- they helped the judges get elected. They helped the sheriffs get elected. You know, they were -- they had their fingers in it. So I would say they were definitely synonymous with law enforcement. Having been a solicitor, you know that happens.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. During the time that you had -- were in a professional relationship with Alex, was he also working at the Solicitor's Office?
- A. I am not real sure. You know, his father was a solicitor when Alex started banking with me. And I'm not sure. I know Alex was an assistant solicitor -- I think he was an assistant solicitor until 2021 when all of this broke. But I'm not sure when he became that. But, yes, I would see him numerous times with his father. And I don't think he was real active, but I think he would do some smaller cases every once in a while for the Solicitor's Office in Hampton.
 - Q. Okay. And to your knowledge, did he have any banking relationships with other banks besides Palmetto State?
 - A. Yes, he did. I know he banked at Bank of America.

 I know he had credit cards at other places. Those are just two offhand I can think of real quick.
 - Q. You said that other lawyers from PMPED also were

customers of the bank?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- A. Yes, sir, most of them were. Not -- I wouldn't say all of them, because they have other offices. But most were customers of our bank.
- Q. Okay. And can you tell us a little bit about the compensation structure at PMPED as you saw it from when you were banking at Palmetto State?
- We are going to talk just of compensation of the attornevs. They were paid a salary. I think their final salary last year I remember seeing was somewhere around 100-, \$110,000 a year, which is a pretty good salary. That's a drop in the bucket usually or not a substantial amount for a lot of them. And the way they get the balance is they get a -- it's all done by the amount of business or settlements that they bring in, business. I'm not sure how to the term this, the amount of fees that they collected during the year. They take that, put it in a pool. They have a certain amount for overhead, let's just say -- I think Ronnie Crosby said, what was it, about 7 1/2 percent, they will take that 7 1/2 out, their expenses for their paralegals, their part of the rent on the office building, because they rented it from themselves, and then the rest would be theirs.
- Q. And so when would they typically get the bulk of their income from PMPED during the year?

- A. Late December, 1st of January.
- Q. That's when the bonuses came out?
 - A. Yes, sir.

1.3

2.1

- Q. And so there's been a lot of testimony about Alex Murdaugh and he's living large here. Did you ever see any red flags with him over the course of your life knowing him?
- A. I didn't. I'm still, you know, just shocked when I see all of what took place. It's just how did you miss it? You know, it's sort of like -- I used this analogy of maybe of a girlfriend or a husband and wife that are cheating on each other, and when they catch them, and all of a sudden you are like, how did I miss all the signs? They were right there in front of me. They were. They were right there in front of me. Not just me, the whole -- as you've heard over this court, it was right in front of everybody. And we missed it, and I wish I hadn't. I promise you, I do.
- Q. Well, you said the red flags. What are you talking about?
- A. Just like with the checks, you know, that he would bring in, he would always have a story. You know, he was loud. He was gregarious. He was -- I mean, as Jeanne said, chaotic. When he came in the office, it was -- I could hear him when he hit the door. Granted, I am sitting in the lobby, but I could hear him when he hit the door. And he would walk in and say, hey, I need you to do this, I need you

to do that, loud, always in a rush, talking on the cell phone, walking in and out to go talk to people. And it was his way to disarm you. And you just thought that was him.

1.3

2.1

Now, with the benefit of hindsight, it was all an act. I mean, he absolutely -- every action or every contact that I had with him now I suspect that it was -- what was the ulterior motive? You know, because now we are seeing him in a whole different light than anybody saw him.

- Q. And what was your impression of Alex professionally?
- A. He was a very successful attorney. He and his brother practiced together. And I get a little off subject right here. And I will get to that exactly. And I also say his brother, very organized, very detailed, will analyze something to death. Alex was the loud, the -- I wouldn't say bully, but in some ways, he would be, but he was gregarious. I mean, he was full of life, or so he seemed to be. And I always would tell, you know, if I had a really detailed case, I would go to Randy. That would be Randy Murdaugh IV. But if I had a case that I needed a little bit of bull thrown in there, you know, because it was a little shaky, go to Alex, he was full of it. I mean, he could -- it was unbelievable how he could just talk, how he knew everybody.

I mean, if you ever had to ride somewhere with him,

I did one time -- first of all, he's a terrible driver;

second, he stops everywhere to talk to somebody. And it's

- just like, come on, man, we've got to go, I've got things to
 do today. And that's just Alex. That's the way he was.

 Never met a stranger. He was very, very outgoing.
 - Q. And where is PMPED, or I guess their former offices now, in comparison or in relation to Palmetto State Bank?
 - A. I wish I could draw it. You know, if you look at that plastic whatever shield right there in front of you, let's say that plastic shield is the courthouse or the courthouse square, we are on one side, they are on the other. So we are literally quarter of a mile, maybe a little more than that across from each other. We are very close.
 - O. What about the courthouse?
- 13 A. It's between us.

2.1

- Q. And is the probate court in the courthouse?
- 15 A. Yes, sir, it's in the courthouse.
 - Q. So let me go back to the fall of 2021, particularly in September, October, time frame. When did you first start to suspect that Alex was involved in something bigger than what you knew at the time?
 - A. Well, as they've testified, Jeanne and those came over and said that, you know, they were investigating him for missing fees somewhere in September. I don't remember exact dates. Until then, I never, never would have suspected anything. I mean, I saw his tax returns. He made a lot of money. I mean, I couldn't imagine it. It's still hard to

believe it.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. And how much money was he typically earning per year?
- A. My sister testified to that. She said over the last decade it was a million and a half a year. You know, there were a lot of years he made multiples of millions. And then some years he would make just a couple of hundred thousand, which is a lot of money. However, for his lifestyle and what -- I wouldn't say his lifestyle. But, yeah, that's right. It cost a lot. I mean, it cost a lot to keep up a farm and a beach house and other things. But he made a lot of money.
- Q. And how did you view his financial risks as they were presenting themselves to the bank during that time?
- A. You know, he wasn't like A-1 credit. I mean, there was no way, you couldn't even argue that. But I wouldn't say that he was a really risky credit. He had a lot of debt.

 However, he also -- with the income, cash flow statements.

 He was terrible at managing his checking account. I mean, it's been well-documented across this case. But he was a very low-risk, because, one, his job, his ability to earn money and, you know, just we didn't -- and our longevity. I want to say he had been banking with us since the late '80s. So we have a lot of history which gives you a lot of comfort, which also in hindsight, opened us up to a lot of things, or

me up to a lot of things.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. So there's been a lot of testimony about overdrafts.

 And was it common for him to be in overdraft status in any of his accounts?
- A. Absolutely. He just would write checks and we would just cover them. And it's not that cavalier, but he did. He overdrafted frequently. Lots of times he would have three or four accounts. He had a farm account. He had two personal accounts. And those are basically his three accounts. He maybe would have \$100,000 in one account and be overdrawn in the other. And I would transfer money. And a lot of times we would lend him money, as you've heard over and over. We would lend him money to cover the overdrafts until the end of the year or until he got money from selling property. I mean, we definitely helped him cover those overdrafts on many, many occasions.
- Q. Do you think you gave him more leeway than other customers?
- A. I think we did. I would say yes, we did, because of our longstanding history, his ability to -- his ability on repayment, ability on earning. I mean, so we didn't feel there was a risk, but, yes.
- Q. And throughout your time dealing with him professionally at the bank, fair to say the FDIC examiners were performing their regular examinations?

A. Absolutely, as you've heard numerous times. They would be in there every 12 to -- they are supposed to be in there at least every 18 months, but just to be realistic, every 12 to 24 months we would have an examination. Alex Murdaugh being one of our largest borrowers would be looked at. His loans were looked at. And I believe there were actually some e-mails that have gone around that has shown, hey, I need to come cover this, FDIC. We are trying to, you know -- everybody wants to put the good foot forward with the Government. So we were trying to make sure that we didn't have a \$100,000 overdraft. Would they see it? Absolutely, because they are going to see his account, but they will also see it get covered. But, yes, they looked at him numerous, numerous times.

- Q. And did they ever raise any concerns about him?
- A. Maybe before I really started dealing with him, but I never recall them ever really raising any concerns. I knew that one report you saw from Risk Management Group where these were internal auditors downgrading him, where the bank had him as a 3 to a 4. That was the only thing. But he was still an acceptable credit.
- Q. So, in fact, do you know how much money in interest the bank earned from him over the years?
- A. I did not until yesterday.
- 25 Q. Okay.

1.3

2.1

- A. It was \$4 million. I knew it was a lot, though.
 - Q. So going back into September, when did you first start to suspect he was involved in a criminal activity?
- A. Well, when all of this started going on, Jeanne, as you all heard, she is my sister-in-law, was the CFO or the accountant for PMPED, Mark Ball, Ronnie Crosby, there were several of them that came over to talk to me. And when they told me they were missing fees, that's criminal activity. So I would safely say then, but more so when I started doing the research for them, and they would say, hey, we've got a case, blah, blah, blah, and they quickly asked me not to e-mail anything, to either come over in person or call, because they did not want it on e-mail because that would be --
 - MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay.
- THE WITNESS: It's not hearsay.
- THE COURT: Mr. Laffitte, I get to do the rulings
 here.
- 18 THE WITNESS: I know. I'm sorry, sir.
- 19 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 20 BY MR. AUSTIN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

- Q. Do you remember when the first conversation was you had with them about missing funds, just the date?
- 23 A. No, sir, I do not remember the date.
- 24 Q. Okay. Do you remember the approximate time frame?
- 25 A. It was -- it would have to be September. I remember

```
there was so much going on during this time in September.
 1
     Labor Day weekend was when the accident happened. He got
 2
     shot. And I remember because that was when I first realized
 3
     that he did drugs. I never thought he did drugs. But, no, I
 4
     can't remember the exact date.
 5
              And how did you realize he did drugs at that point?
 6
 7
        Α.
              You know, there was that rumor floating around --
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Your Honor, hearsay.
 8
              THE COURT: Sustained.
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: And irrelevant.
10
              THE COURT: Hold it just a minute. What you got to
11
     say with that, Mr. Austin?
12
              MR. AUSTIN: I believe -- well, I don't want to put
1.3
    words in his mouth.
14
              THE COURT: Here's my concern. If he has a reason
15
     that affects his actions, he can testify to that.
16
              MR. AUSTIN: Thank you.
17
              THE COURT: But he needs to lay a foundation of his
18
    basis for that. This is not offered for the truth of the
19
     matter. It's offered for his state of mind. Go ahead.
20
              THE WITNESS: When Mr. Murdaugh went to the hospital
2.1
```

in Savannah, he was taken there. They published -- I guess
Freedom of Information Act, and it was published in the paper
his toxicology report. Until then, I would have never, ever
dreamed that he would have ever done drugs.

Q. So you don't have any direct knowledge yourself?

That's just your understanding from what you saw in the paper?

1.3

2.1

2.4

- A. That's correct. I've never seen him do drugs, never been around him, never anything.
- Q. And how much would you all socialize in your adult lives?
- A. Very little. We had a neighborhood Christmas between the three families on our street. We had a neighborhood Christmas. We would get together. And the last few years, Alex had actually quit coming. I'm not sure why. But we still would get together like the week of Christmas. Christmas Eve we would all get together. And I would see him obviously, if there was a wedding, we might see each other at a wedding. We might pass each other on the river or something. We rarely socialized. We just ran completely different circles, different age groups.
- Q. Okay. And so you testified about starting research for the law firm. What did that consist of?
- A. They would deliver a check either a handwritten note as we've seen in evidence with checks listed out, and they would ask me, hey, can you research these checks, see where they went. And, you know, we will pull the check, see the offset, and then try to trace it on down the best we can, you know. If it goes to an outside bank, that's the end of it,

we can't see it. But if it's a money order, if the check comes in and there's a money order and then the money order was cashed, we can see whether it was cashed, whether it was deposited into a checking account. And that's what we were doing for them, we were trying to track the money, who got benefit of the money.

- Q. And when you say you were trying to track it, would you also produce documents?
 - A. Lots of documents.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. And do a lot of these documents come from your personal files?
- A. Not so many for the law firm. For SLED, ODC, FBI, those, many of those came from my personal documents from when I was serving as conservator. But for the most part, when we were doing the research for PMPED, those were bank documents that were on our image system.
- Q. And why would they come to you for that help with the research?
- A. I had been -- you know, I was probably one of the main contacts for PMPED. I mean, usually most of the lawyers came to see me. And Jeanne Seckinger, their CFO, is my sister-in-law. So I believe that's why.
- Q. You mentioned providing documents to law enforcement, too. Starting with SLED, when do you first hear from SLED?

A. It was either September or October at the latest.

And, I mean, David Williams from SLED, I think he was out of the Beaufort office, we were in frequent contact doing research for them on different things and them requesting documents and us providing them to them.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. And did Palmetto State hire an attorney or attorneys during that time to assist with anything related to what was going on with Alex and this growing storm?
- A. We hired attorneys when -- actually, I do know when I know. We hired attorneys when we were served with a lawsuit or served with a potential -- I am not exactly sure what you call it. We were served papers of intent to sue or whatever by Bland and Richter on Gloria Satterfield's case that's been talked about several times. That would actually be the first time that I realized he did some criminal activities.
- Q. And do you know approximately what date that would have been?
 - A. No, sir, I don't, but it was September.
 - Q. Okay. And so you said that you were in touch with David Williams at SLED. Did you ultimately sit for an interview with them?
- A. I did. It was SLED and FBI. And there was a videoed interview of me.
- O. And was that in November?

- 1 A. I'm not sure if it was October or November, sir.
- Q. Did you provide them documents during that interview and any other time?
 - A. I did. I provided them documents any time they asked. I mean, I was happy to help them try to figure out whatever I could.
 - Q. And did you have attorneys at the time?
- 8 A. We did.

5

6

- 9 Q. And when you met with SLED, the FBI, did you bring 10 an attorney with you?
- 11 A. I did not.
- 12 Q. Why not?
- A. Didn't think I needed them. You know, I had -- I knew what we had done. And so I was just providing the documents. You know, there wasn't anything to hide, do what -- you know, give it to them, help them fix it, whatever we have to do, let's get it right.
- Q. And have you seen a number of those documents in evidence during the trial?
- A. Most of these documents we are looking at, not all of them, but a vast majority.
- Q. Okay. And do those include documents that you provided to law enforcement and to PMPED?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. All right. And you mentioned that you had met

with -- or you provided documents to ODC. Did you ultimately
meet with them as well?

A. I did.

1.3

2.1

- Q. Let me back up real quick. What is ODC?
- A. Office of Disciplinary Counsel. They are -- my understanding is that they are the FDIC for the lawyers. They are the ones that, you know, if you overdraw your trust account at a bank, we have to report it. That's who we report it to. And they are, I guess, the governing body if they have to be sanctioned, pull a law license. That's who handles it, to my understanding. And I sat for an interview with them over three days back in this past summer, June or July.
 - Q. Okay. And you are not a lawyer, though, right?
- 15 A. No, sir.
- Q. So why would you meet with Office of Disciplinary
 Counsel?
 - A. You want to help them. You want to help get to the bottom of what took place, why did it take place, how did it take place so that it doesn't happen again. And I mean, I had no obligations to sit with them. You know, I wanted to do what was right and to try to tell them what took place and see if I could help them in any way.
 - Q. All right. And did you end up meeting with the U.S. Attorney's Office and the Attorney General's Office?

```
MS. LIMEHOUSE: Your Honor, may we approach?
 1
              THE COURT: You may.
 2
              (Whereupon, a bench conference takes place off the
 3
     record.)
 4
              THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
 5
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: We've been very clear in our filings
 6
     that he lied to us during his interview. And if they intend
 7
     to use his coming and meeting to us to his benefit, we will
 8
     impeach him with the lies he told us during the proffer.
              THE COURT: Sure, you will. That's your -- that's
10
     entirely your right.
11
              (Whereupon, the bench conference ends.)
12
              THE COURT: Mr. Austin, please continue.
13
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
14
              So you met with the U.S. Attorney's Office and AG's
15
         Q.
     Office?
16
              I did.
         Α.
17
              Where did you meet with them?
18
         Q.
         Α.
              In Columbia at -- I'm going to assume that was the
19
     U.S. Attorney's Office. I'm really not sure. But it was one
20
     of their offices.
2.1
              And were there agents from SLED and FBI there as
22
     well?
23
              Yes, sir, there were.
2.4
         Α.
              All right. And when did that take place?
25
         Q.
```

- A. That was in February of '21, I believe. Might have been March, but February, March, April, right -- first part of '21.
 - Q. And did you sign any documents or agreements with the U.S. Attorney's Office and the AG's Office?
 - A. It was a proffer -- my understanding, it was a proffer agreement. And I signed whatever that document was.
- Q. What was your understanding of your obligations under that agreement?
- 10 A. I was to tell the truth. And that's pretty much it, 11 yeah.
- Q. And to this date, have either the AG's Office or
 U.S. Attorney's Office moved to hold you in breach of those
 agreements?
- MS. LIMEHOUSE: Your Honor --
- 16 THE COURT: I sustain that objection.
- 17 BY MR. AUSTIN:

5

6

- Q. All right. So you talked with those offices then.
- 19 You said you had three meetings with ODC?
- 20 A. Three days of meetings, yes.
- Q. And did you also participate in a civil deposition after -- I guess during 2022?
- A. I did. I was being deposed by the estate -- the lawsuit on the estate of Mallory Beach, which was the boat wreck that Alex Murdaugh's son was involved in. And I was

- deposed by -- I'm not sure which lawyer, but one of the lawyers involved with that lawsuit. There were a lot of lawyers in the room that day.
 - Q. You didn't assert your Fifth Amendment right?
 - A. I did not.

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Seems like you are giving a lot of statements. Why did you want to do that?
- A. I don't feel like I have anything to hide. I mean,
 I made some mistakes, which we will go through in great
 detail today. You know, but I didn't feel like there was -I definitely, without a doubt, thought I had civil liability.
 And so the best thing you can do when you make mistakes,
 stand up, own up, and fix it.
 - Q. And is it your testimony that you did not know Alex Murdaugh was stealing from anybody?
 - A. Absolutely did not know he was stealing from anybody until we did research, no.
 - Q. Okay. So let's get into some of these conservatorships since it's such a big part of the case. How did you come to be involved in any of these conservatorships?
 - A. I believe the first conservatorship that I ever dealt with was the Plyler family. Let's not just say the girls, because there was the PR with Angela and Justin and then there were the two Plyler girls, which I saw in court. He contacted me, asked me, said, hey, we've got this big

- case, we need to get a conservator for the girls and PR to 1 handle the -- work with on the case, can you do it? And you 2 know, I had no idea whether we could do that. I never been 3 approached by it. So I looked in the handbook, or policy 4 book or whatever, and it says that we would be discouraged 5 from doing, but didn't say we couldn't do it. So then I 6 walked back to my father's office, who is in the same 7 building as us. And I asked him, I said, can we do this? 8 And I got permission to do it. And so that started it.
 - Q. And was it your understanding that permission was for you to do it as part of your role as a banker or was it outside that role?
- A. It was outside of the bank, absolutely not part of the bank. The bank could not be a fiduciary.
 - Q. All right. Why not?
 - A. We weren't registered. Our trust department, we didn't have a trust department registered as a fiduciary with the Board, South Carolina State Board of Financial Institutions.
 - Q. So it's your understanding that other banks are registered and can serve as fiduciaries?
- A. I would think there are some. I wouldn't think
 there are a lot.
 - Q. But Palmetto State isn't it?
- 25 A. No, sir.

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.4

- Q. In your mind when you were serving as conservator or PR, were you doing it in your role as a banker or something outside of that role?
 - A. I was doing it as a role of an individual to help my friend, my customer.
 - Q. Okay. And what in your understanding your general obligations to be as conservator or PR?
 - A. Generally, very generally, I was to get the money from the settlement, the estate or whatever, and protect that money and take care of it, hopefully and make it grow. But that didn't always -- was not always the case, depending on the expenses that you had, whether it grew or not. And when the people -- the minors turned 18 or whatever happened, then you disburse all the money back to them, to the family.
 - Q. Okay. You mentioned people turning 18. Is that the case with the Plyler sisters?
 - A. That's correct.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. And can you take us through the process of becoming a conservator? If we can pull up Government's Exhibit 137. So after you got permission from your father, what happened after that?
- A. I spoke to Alex Murdaugh and said, you know, hey, I could be the conservator. And he said, all right. And we went from there. And he said, you know, they file the petition for us. I mean, just like you heard from Tiffany,

- 1 | we don't file the petition, the lawyers, the law firm does.
- Q. I'm sorry. Are you done?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. So when you received -- tell me about signing this document. Do you remember signing it?
- 6 A. I don't remember signing it, but I did do it.
- Q. Okay. What year was it that this would have been presented to you?
 - A. Yes, sir, this one would have been.
- 10 Q. What year would you have received this?
- 11 A. This is Hannah Plyler. That would have been somewhere '06, '07.
- Q. Okay. And up here you are listed as applicant or petitioner. Was it your understanding at the time that you were the person applying to the probate court?
- A. No, sir. I was the person that was being appointed.
- 17 I wasn't the one that was doing the petition.
- Q. Okay. You had never seen this document before, had you?
- 20 A. Not until I signed it, no, sir, or until the first one.
- Q. All right. And what do you remember about how Alex would bring documents like this to you for signature?
- A. He would walk in, make a big to-do. You know, just like any other document, he would have it flipped open and,

- you know, hey, I need you to sign right here, this is 1 such-and-such. And you would sign what he said, because, you 2 know, he's your attorney or the attorney in the case and he's 3 representing these people and you are trying to help him. 4 And he just marched -- it's much like if you had come into me 5 for a mortgage loan. I'm going to say, hey, sir, this loan 6 is set up just as we discussed for 60 months, payments are 7 such-and-such, you know, and give you the basics. And then 8 say, I need you to sign here, here, and here. And typically, most people are not going to sit there and read every page or 10
 - Q. And did you go through every bit of information in this form when you received it?

look through every page. They would just glance at it.

- A. No, because I wouldn't know all of this information on them at that time. But --
- Q. Did you know the Plyler girls or their parents prior to working on their case?
- 18 A. No, sir, I did not.
- Q. All right. And so let's go to, I believe, page 3.
- 20 All right. And these are your signatures here?
- 21 A. They are.

11

12

1.3

14

- Q. I don't know why I'm circling them. I think you can see them. Why would you sign in these places?
- 24 A. That's where I was told to, honestly.
- 25 Q. And why would you just sign it without knowing for

1 sure?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

- A. It's part of the trust. You know, you trust that somebody is doing it right. Just like if I was doing a loan, you would trust me that I'm doing the loan right.
 - Q. Okay. Once you signed it, what happened after that?
- A. They would take it and file it with the probate court, or I assume it all went through probate court for the -- to have it petitioned. And I would be appointed conservator and then we would start.
- Q. All right. And once you are up and running as conservator, were you involved in any of the legal proceedings?
- A. I was. On the Plylers, you know, I actually came down here several times, you know, for mediations and different things. And that was actually the first time I ever met them. They were very young. We were down here in mediation way before settlement.
 - Q. Okay. And were you in touch with their father?
- A. He would call me every so often, more so after the settlement, but I did definitely talk -- touch base with him.
- Q. And without getting too deep into it, was he a steady source of support for the daughters, from what you could tell?
 - A. No. When he called me, he was wanting money.
 - Q. And, again, what was your understanding of what your

job was with the conservatorship funds? 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

2.4

- I was to protect them until they were 18, and have them and, you know, invest them, put them in deposits, just, you know, and I had to pay their bills and living expenses and all of that.
- And the money that came into the conservatorship, did you keep it all at Palmetto State Bank?
- I didn't. I split it up between the different --Α. several different banks, BB&T, South Carolina Bank and Trust, which is now SouthState, well, I guess BB&T is now Truist, and Bank of Walterboro, which is now Bank of the Lowcountry, and Palmetto State Bank.
 - Why did you do that? Ο.
- Because the FDIC, at that time, the insurance limits were \$100,000. So we were trying to watch that \$100,000 limit.
- And is that all to protect the money? 17 Ο.
 - Yes, sir. Α.
- So at the time this conservatorship started and the Q. money comes into Palmetto State, what kind of account was it put in? 2.1
 - It was originally put in -- I guess when it first came in, it probably went into their checking account. I would have to go back to look at the records to see that. But we put it into either CDs, money markets, or saving

- accounts. Those are the only three options that we have at Palmetto State Bank.
 - Q. And I believe you became, according to this document, conservator in around the end of 2006. And when was the first loan that you took out of the account?
 - A. July something, 2011.
 - Q. Okay. And you are talking about purchasing a certificate of deposit. Did you purchase one for the Plylers?
 - A. Yes, sir, I did.

1.3

2.1

- Q. What were the rates that CDs were getting at that point?
- A. When we first got the money, the case was not settled until 2009. And when we first got the money, CDs, some were one eight, somewhere right in there, I believe is what they were.
 - Q. 1.8 percent?
- A. Yes, sir. And we were in a falling rate environment at that time. We were -- the economy -- this is 2009. As y'all well remember what happened between -- with the recession or whatever you want to call the Great Correction. And so we actually went from there into one of the lowest -- longest running low-rate environments ever in the country.
- Q. Okay. And so when -- how did you end up taking the loans out? Can you just walk through? First you thought

about it and how did it come to your attention that that's a 1 possibility? 2 Mr. Murdaugh came into my office or spoke to me one 3 Α. day about it. And he said, you know, I was wondering about 4 getting a loan. And he asked me. And I said, well, I just 5 don't know, I would have to go over to the judge. When I say 6 7 the judge, the probate judge. She was over between our offices. And so, you know, I told him I would get back in 8 touch with him. And I walked over and spoke to the judge. MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay. 10 THE COURT: You can't say what the judge said. 11 BY MR. AUSTIN: 12 Based on your conversation with her, did you believe 1.3 0. that you could take out a loan from the conservatorship 14 account? 15 Α. Absolutely. 16 MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. Hearsay. 17 THE COURT: That's violating my order. 18 MR. AUSTIN: Sorry. 19 THE COURT: You know, if you want to have the 20 testimony of a person, you call that witness. I sustain the 2.1 objection. 22

23 BY MR. AUSTIN:

2.4

25

Q. What did you do based on your conversation with Judge Odom? I mean, let me back up there. What is the name

of the probate judge in Hampton County? 1 2 Α. Sheila Odom. And you said you walked over and spoke with her. 3 Ο. What did you do next? 4 MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. He's trying 5 to do the same thing. 6 THE COURT: You know, don't try to skirt my ruling. 7 MR. AUSTIN: I am not, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: You can call the witness. You can call 9 any witness you need. But you can't get in testimony of 10 people by hearsay. I sustain the objection. Move on. 11 BY MR. AUSTIN: 12 So you started taking loans out, correct? 1.3 0. That's correct. Α. 14 And you don't deny that? 15 Q. No, sir. Α. 16 And do you deny any of the documents you've seen in 17 Q. this case being accurate and authentic documents? 18 None that I've seen so far. 19 Q. 20 And you are not denying that you ever engaged in any of these transactions you are accused engaging in? 2.1 Hm-mm, no, sir. 22 Α. But you are saying that you just didn't steal or try 23

A. Did not know in any way that I was helping

to steal or try to help steal?

2.4

facilitate the theft by Alex Murdaugh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

19

- Q. Okay. So when Alex came to you to talk about the loan, did he get a loan first or did you get a loan first?
- A. I did the first one. One of the reasons behind that, you know, he asked me about it, and then never followed up. So I waited. I want to say it might have even been like six months before he got one. I'm not sure. It's on the sheets.
- Q. And how do you view or how did you view the loan in this situation?
- Α. It was an investment for the girls. You know, we 11 were -- I was always trying to make them money. And I would 12 do -- like, I could speak for what I was doing. I was -- I 1.3 knew I was going to borrow money. So I borrowed it from 14 them. I paid them a higher rate than -- I always tried to at 15 least make sure it was twice what they would have earned 16 anywhere else. And I wanted to make sure that, you know, 17 they were earning money. 18
 - Q. And what kind of rate did you pick for their -- these loans?
- A. I paid anywhere, I want to say, 3 1/4 percent to 1 1/2 percent.
- Q. At the time you said, for CDs, was around 1.4 to 1.8?
- 25 A. Correct.

- Q. So, effectively, you doubled it?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

- Q. All right. And why would you think that that would be a suitable risk to take with these girls' money?
- A. Well, I wasn't in default, one. I'm not sure as a bank officer that I could default on a loan. I mean, let's qualify that. Things happen. You get hit by a bus, you've got a problem. But they wouldn't have had a problem because it was memorialized everywhere. I mean, there was no shortages of where it was memorialized. But I also had it secured, like you've heard multiple times, 2,741 or 2,471 shares of Palmetto State Bank stock.
- Q. Did you document all of this with the probate court in your yearly accounting?
 - A. Yes, sir, I did. It was in the annual accounting.
- Q. Okay. And why did you do that?
- Wasn't anything to hide. It was just, you know, she 17 Α. knew what was going on with the thing. So, I mean, we put 18 it -- I am not trying to hide anything. This is the 19 conservator's money. You have to account for it and account 20 for it accurately. So that's -- I mean, it's in there. 2.1 on the -- you would see it on the annual accountings. You 22 would see it listed in annual income that would show 23 interest. And it clearly would say loan interest or interest 2.4 on loans. And then you would have expenses. And then I 25

would have assets. And it would clearly show loans if there were any out there.

- Q. But wasn't there an order in place saying you had to run any expenditures past the probate court?
 - A. There was.
- Q. Did you do that?
- 7 A. Absolutely.

3

4

5

6

8

16

17

- Q. Did you do that with the loans?
- A. I did not.
- Q. Why not?
- 11 A. Because it's not an expenditure. It's an

 12 investment. As you heard Tiffany say earlier, Tiffany

 13 Provence say earlier, you know, an expenditure, that money is

 14 gone, it's not coming back. These loans were coming back,

 15 either in the form of payments or payoffs.
 - Q. Okay. And how does that documentation that you filed with the probate court compare to documents that you would see on file with the bank in similar loans?
- 19 A. They are very similar.
- 20 Q. And how so?
- A. I mean, you have a promissory note that is signed by
 the borrower. I do know there are several that we could
 not -- that I could not find. I don't know where they are.
 I wish we could find them. When we were doing the research,
 I found them, and found that we had several that we couldn't

find. But we also -- regardless of that, we had it documented on a spreadsheet that was filed with the probate court. And we also had it listed out through checking accounts and on the asset, the balance sheet.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. And did you save copies of these documents for yourself as well?
- A. I did. Every year when I did my annual accounting, I made three copies, one for the conservatee, one for the probate court, and one for myself.
- Q. And when the girls turned 18, did you provide these documents to them?
- A. I did. I provided all the documents. It was a box of documents. I mean, there was a big binder for each year.
 - Q. And did you set up annuities for the girls as well?
- A. I did. We set up a structured settlement when they -- when we were first going through mediation, we wanted to put -- we wanted to protect the money. And we set it up -- a lot of the money in a structured settlement so they could have income over their -- for the rest of their life, which they do. And that was actually the first time I had ever done, on the Plylers, was the first time I ever had to go through and do a structure. And just like she -- we talked about earlier this morning about having to look at the different types of insurance, when you want payments to start and different options.

- Q. Okay. Setting up an annuity by itself, would you say that that is a decent amount of work, or no?
 - A. It's not a lot of work. But, you know, you have to look at it. You have to read it and study it and think about what you are trying to do or what your goal is with the money, is what you are trying to figure out.
 - Q. Okay. So let's talk about loans to Alex Murdaugh.
 - A. Yes, sir.

4

5

6

7

8

10

- Q. There's been a lot of testimony about him receiving unsecured loans at a higher rate than what you gave yourself.

 Can you explain that for the jury, please?
- A. Simply, they were unsecured. They were going to be at a higher rate than what a secured loan would be.
- Q. And is it common for the bank to make unsecured loans?
- A. As the bank, we made them all the time, unsecured, partially secured, and secured. I mean, that's what we do.
- 18 Q. What about in amounts as much as you gave to Alex 19 here?
- 20 A. Absolutely.
- MR. AUSTIN: Will you pull up Government's Exhibit
- 22 | 130.
- 23 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. All right. Now, are these -- can you explain, what is this document?

- A. This is a spreadsheet that I started so we would
 have it. If you see -- if I touch the screen, does it write
 on it?
 - Q. I think so. I'm not sure.
 - A. It does. Up here is the loan number. That corresponds and, really, original corresponds with the date the loan was made. And this shows how the loan works. This loan shows the payoff. These numbers down here just shows the principal. When I say "down here," down here, shows the principal and interest. And each loan should have really a little number, that way you can follow it down.
- 12 Q. And how would Alex go about paying back these loans?
 - A. He would bring in a check. There were different ways. But, you know, now that I see, now that I've done the research, he paid a lot of them back with stolen funds.
 - Q. And at the time, did you have any idea that that's how he was paying them back?
- 18 A. Absolutely not.
- 19 Q. Would you have used stolen funds to pay them back?
- 20 A. No, sir.

6

7

8

10

11

1.3

14

15

16

- Q. And how did you go about paying off the loans that you made personally?
- A. I used several different ways. I either paid -- I
 didn't pay a lot out of my pocket, but I did pay some. Wher
 I say "out of my pocket," out of my normal work income from

- Palmetto State Bank at the time. But I would also -- any of
 my fees that I earned as PR or conservator, I used that as
 fees to pay the loans down. And then at the end, I borrowed
 the money from a -- I refinanced it through Mr. Parker and
- 5 paid it off.

- Q. When you got a loan from Mr. Parker, why didn't you just get a loan from the bank?
 - A. Well, I couldn't borrow from the bank.
- Q. Why not?
- 10 A. It's called RegO.
- 11 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. It's called what?
- A. Regulation O. We could only borrow for very limited things, primary residence, and I think you can borrow to send your kids to college or something like that, but that's about
- Q. Why didn't you go to another bank?
- A. I would rather pay somebody that banks with me and supports me. I would rather support them than versus somebody else.
- MR. AUSTIN: And let's pull up Government's Exhibit
- 22 BY MR. AUSTIN:

129.

it.

15

2.1

- Q. And what information would you provide to the court each year, the probate court?
- 25 A. This is just one of the pages. This would be

provided every year, because this is a great summary sheet. Just like Tiffany Provence said, they are busy. I mean, all of us are busy. You want just a summary. This is a quick, fast, summary of everything. Shows all your income up here, all your expenses. This number right there is the beginning balance that would have been, let's say, '11, 2011, shows income would have been balance of these numbers right there. That's the income, which is annuity and the interest and any expenses. It should total up to \$450,000. Then you take your assets, which are your CDs, your DDAs, your savings, your money markets, your loans, your other investments, which we didn't have any others, other than loans. And those numbers are to total 5 -- \$450,594.19.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. Let's go up to the income piece of it. Can you explain what those differing items are there?
- A. These different items here are SCB&T savings account. That's money that was in a savings that earned 34 cents in interest in a year. The money market account earned 74 cents. I want to qualify those. Those were not -- we didn't think they would earn a lot. We had a money market and a savings account so I could transfer money to them. Those were basically wash accounts that would -- I would -- when the money market account would get low, I would fund it. And we would go through -- that was how I transferred money to them for their allowances or expenses that they needed.

Then we had interest on the Bank of Walterboro CD, certificate of deposit at Palmetto State, money market at Palmetto State. You had annuity payment, that's from the structured settlement, and then the interest that was paid during 2011 on loans.

- Q. All right. So the loans that you started making in 2011 made 1,300, thereabouts, for the girls?
- A. That was what was paid during the year. They would have accrued more than that.
- Q. Sure. Zoom out, please. And over here, it says beginning balance. So you -- you start out the year 371,000 and change, and ended up at 463,000; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.

1.3

2.1

- Q. Is that consistent with the types of gains they got over the course of your time as conservator?
- A. I never put it out on a spreadsheet to see, but I will say that's probably right. This is Hannah's. She started out at around 290,000 when I first got -- that amount when we first got the settlement. And I want to say it was somewhere in the neighborhood of 650 on the last year.
 - O. So it went from 371 to 650?
- A. You also have to realize that we had annuities of 84 and a half -- \$84,500 each year coming in.
- Q. Okay. And how much do -- do you know how much
 Hannah receives per year, or per month I should say, with her

1 | annuities now?

2

3

4

7

- A. Just over \$7,000 a month. There's a statement somewhere in these records.
 - Q. What about Alania?
- A. Hers, she was hurt worse. So more money went to her. And I want to say hers is around 9- or 10,000 a month.
 - Q. Okay. You said she was hurt worse in the car accident?
- 9 A. In the car accident. So she had more damages
 10 awarded to her.
- MR. AUSTIN: Zoom out, please.
- 12 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. Okay. And then if we go down to this to the assets, can you explain items there?
- A. December 31st, 2011, we had a Bank of Walterboro CD, 54,000. She had nineteen hundred and thirty-five thousand
- dollars (sic) in a DDA account. We tried to keep that as low
- as possible because that was a noninterest -- just normal
- DDAs are noninterest-bearing. The money market account was
- 20 the bulk. And you see South Carolina Bank and Trust savings
- 21 account with \$128,000 money market, and then \$225,000 in
- 22 loans.
- Q. And what is that \$225,000 figure? What does that reflect?
- 25 A. Those reflect my loan.

- 1 Q. The personal loan?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Why would you list that in assets?
- 4 A. The loan is an investment. It's an asset of the conservatorship.
- Q. And as a banker, or I guess, for a bank, how do they
 make money, bank like Palmetto State Bank?
- A. We loan money at a higher rate than what we are paying.
- 10 Q. Okay. And you were a loan officer throughout your time there?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- MR. AUSTIN: Let's go to Government's Exhibit 126.
- 14 I'm sorry. Can we go back to 129? I missed one part.
- 15 BY MR. AUSTIN:

2.4

- Q. All right. And let's go to the left side. Can you talk through some of these expenses?
- A. Sure. The top line, obviously, as you see, is
 allowance. This was the conservator fee, the 2,058.22, that
 was done for 2010. And, you know, we had different fees,
 different -- not fees, different expenses throughout the
 year, cell phone, bank fees, which should have been refunded,
 clothes, Busch Gardens, that was where she went with a trip
- We were talking about her dad earlier. This is

down in Florida, Christmas expenses.

- where we had to pay for a well at his house to get it fixed,
 cell phone claim, new cell phone, I mean, just different
 things. So total expenses for Hannah during that year were
 \$12,809.35.
 - Q. Okay. And you said you set up an allowance. Is that 5,700 there?

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

- A. That's right. It was \$150 a week, I believe.
- Q. And would you say you did a lot of work for the Plyler sisters?
- A. I did. You know, it's a lot -- there was a lot of work involved with them just for the fact they were young girls. And I actually learned something in testimony this week. I never knew she was living out of her car. I wish she had called me and told me that. We would have fixed that.
 - Q. When you say she -- I don't mean to interrupt you. Who are you talking about?
- When Alania said she was living in her car, I mean, 18 that was shocking to me. I absolutely knew they bounced 19 around between family members. They had a tough life, a 20 tough upbringing. And they've really done a great job 2.1 raising themselves. But, yes, we would -- with them, it was 22 a lot of work just because, you know, they are young 23 children. I mean, once you are over 18, you can go do a lot 2.4 of things, you can go get a cell phone. When you are younger 25

- than 18, you cannot go sign a contract. So we would have to go get cell phones. We would have to go get cars, insurance, all kinds of things, because they really did not have much family support. So I did a lot more than I would have with somebody with a lot of family support.
- Q. Now, let's go to Government's Exhibit 126. All right. Let's do the same thing we did with 2011 accounting. We don't have to go through each line. On the income side, see interest and loans, \$19,000. What is that?
- A. That was the interest paid during that year. This is 2014 and just a piece of 2015, depending on -- because she turned 18 and we had to close out. So those are the interests that we paid that we, myself and Alex Murdaugh, paid on those loans during that year. We have to account for it. And that's what that was at closeout.

One thing, if you look on the right side over here, you will see all of these are zero. It's because we have no more. We are closing the conservatorship. The conservatorships assets have to go to zero. That's why you see the expenses over here. You see wire transfer to Hannah and then a money order for Hannah. And that's what those are right there.

- Q. Okay. Listed as expenses, but is that money that you are transferring to them?
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- And why were you transferring that money to them? Q. 1
 - She was 18. Α.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- All right. And -- but where do those figures come Q. from?
 - You take your beginning balance -- I mean, you have to go through up there and all of that. This is a little confusing. You take in the income, beginning balance, income, minus your expenses, and then come up with it. was what it took to zero all of the accounts.
 - And the end balance was 731 -- 731,000? Ο.
- \$651,956, that was including all of her expenses, yes. You can see it was a pretty expensive year. We had to pay taxes to close out conservator fees, car. So it was a pretty expensive year.
 - Okay. I see the allowance at the top of \$10,325. Q. Tell us about that.
 - I would really have to see a breakdown. Remember I said it was a little bit longer than one year. 52 weeks at 150 is 5,200 -- about 7,000 roughly. I am not really great without a calculator. But if you figure out, that's how it I'm just assuming it was 150 a week. came up.
- So that's what you had set up for a weekly allowance? 23
- That's right, automatically go every week. 2.4 Α.
- And then what about all these other expenses, where 25 Q.

would that money come from?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

A. I would have to go and get -- I had -- with the Plylers, I was going back and forth over to the probate judge all the time. So we actually set up a \$2,000-a-month normal living expense, where I could spend it without having to get more -- higher approval. And so other than that, as long as, you know, it was something normal, I could just go over there and I didn't have to get all the approvals. Other than that, we've got those petition for expenditures to get things that were, like, special, like a car. You know, I couldn't authorize that.

And, you know, Christmas, we would talk to them about the conservator fees. Those were approved by the probate judge. And, you know, we would go through. And I'm next door to the probate judge, even if we didn't -- we were in close contact.

- Q. Okay. So tell me more about the car. Did you buy a car for Alania besides this one?
- 19 A. This is Hannah.
- 20 Q. I'm sorry. I meant Hannah.
- A. No. I believe this is the only car. And I did buy two for Alania.
- Q. So when did you buy those cars?
- A. The first car I bought her was mid-February 2009. I
 want to say she was -- just turned 16 and she could actually

get herself to school. February, somewhere right in there, I went to the judge. And we knew she was having trouble, as you heard me say earlier. I knew she was bouncing around. She was having trouble getting, you know, to school. And so I went to judge, she was 16, so she would be able to drive to school. So I got permission to go look for a car. And, you know, the judge and I would discuss. And I thought that it would be in the best interest to buy a good used car, was what we did. Yes. She had the money to buy a new car. But as most of us realize, most people get in a wreck as new car drivers, unfortunately. And so we didn't want to buy a new car. But when we bought the car in 2009, February of 2009, we had not settled in the case. So Alania Plyler's conservatorship did not have any money. So the bank, Palmetto State Bank, did a loan for the conservatorship.

1.3

2.1

March, mid-March, 1st of March, somewhere right in there we got all the settlements. And she actually received about -- well, she received I think almost \$5,000,000, about 4.7 million, but 690,000 or somewhere right in that neighborhood came into the conservatorship loans paid off immediately. So she paid about three weeks of interest. But anyhow, that's enough story.

Back on the car. But she kept that car for a couple of months. And, unfortunately, was in a wreck, thankfully unhurt. Totaled the car. And then we ended up buying her a

2009 Malibu.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Okay. And you said she paid two or three weeks of interest. How much do you think that was; do you know?
- A. It's probably about -- the loan, I want to say, was somewhere around 31,000, this is going off memory; \$100, 150 at the most.
- Q. And you testified about Alania living in her car at one point. Did you help her at some point purchase a house?
 - A. I did.
 - Q. And can you take us through that process?
- Α. I will. I'm still shocked that I've learned that this week, because we would have made some type of arrangement. I mean, I know it's hard when somebody is living 100 miles from you, which is what we lived apart roughly. But once she came to me and we were having -- like I said, I knew she was bouncing back and forth. I went to --I spoke with the judge about getting permission to buy a house. Got permission. Got a budget. And I don't remember what the budget was now, but let's just say \$150,000. And so we started looking for houses. No, she started looking for And she would send me different things. And I would go back and forth over to probate and look at them. And the biggest thing that I was worried about with her buying a house was resale. She's 17 years old. She's not going to live in this house forever, I would highly doubt and so --

especially not with the budget she had. So I was real concerned about resale. So, you know, she would find a house, we would look at it. And on one of the houses, I don't remember where it was, but we liked it. She liked it. So, personally, when I say "we liked it," I really don't have anything in it other than I'm buying it. I am not living there. I am not -- you know, I will go up there and see it, but that's the extent of it. But once she picked it out and we got a rough approval for it, I got a home inspection on one of them, and it failed because it had a gas leak. The people wouldn't fix the gas leak from under the house. So we backed out of the contract. And then we ended up buying the house that she bought. And I want to say it was like 140, 160,000.

1.3

2.1

- Q. What were some of the factors you looked for in helping her pick a house?
- A. I wanted something that she would be able to get out of without absolutely taking a bath and lose a lot of money when she resells it. You know, except in Charleston, you need three bedrooms, two baths minimum. It was just hard to sell if you have a three-bedroom and a one-bath house. It's a pretty hard sale. You look at kitchens, is the kitchen updated? You don't want an outdated kitchen. But other than -- that was my thought, how's she going to get out of this when she's 21, 22, 23, or whenever she decides to sell

- this house, because she was going to have the funds that she could buy a much nicer house or whatever she wanted when she turned 18.
 - Q. Why did you care about trying to get her set up with a house like that if she could sell?
- A. I wouldn't want her to lose money. You know, she

 was -- first time I had ever done this. I mean, you care

 about them. I mean, you are not really close to them,

 because you don't see them. You are not like your next-door

 neighborhood or your good buddy that you see all of the time,

 but I talked to her regularly. And, you know, you are

 helping them and you want to see them succeed and not waste

 money and do whatever.
 - Q. And what happened -- well, I guess, did you think you were acting in their best interest in purchasing the house?
- 17 A. I do.

5

14

15

- Q. And everything else you did with the loans and all that?
- 20 A. I do. Can I qualify that?
- 21 O. Sure.
- A. I do think I was acting in the best interest with the loans; however, now I wish I hadn't done mine just for optics. And that's the only reason.
- Q. You made the girls money or you made Hannah money

1 from your loans?

1.3

2.1

2.4

- A. That's right.
- Q. And for Alex?
- A. That's right.
- Q. You never thought you were paying any of them off with stolen funds?
 - A. Absolutely not.
 - Q. What happened when Alania turned 18?
- A. When Alania turned 18, we went -- obviously, we were closing out the accounts. And I got her and actually went and met with her up at -- I'm not sure when we absolutely closed everything out. But I met with her up in Harbison at the SouthState Bank. I got her introduced to a lady up there that I didn't know, but I wanted her to have a bank, informal relationship with a bank. So I met with her. And I took her all of her documents. They were laid out. And I explained to her what her income would be from the annuity. And, you know, it was very clear documents on what she had and what she didn't have.
- Q. Okay. And up until that point, did she know how much money was in any of her accounts?
- A. She did not. We had discussed this between myself, the attorney, and the judge, that we didn't want them to know exactly what they had at that time. Her dad knew. He was well aware of what they had. But we didn't want to tell them

because, I mean, they were 11 and 15 at the time when it

started. I mean, just, you know, they would have thought it

was just like an endless supply of -- and we made a decision

not to tell them at that time.

- Q. So you didn't make that decision unilaterally?
- A. No, no, sir.
 - Q. Okay. And did you file any of your accounting?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.

5

6

7

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

- Q. Have you stayed in touch with either of the Plyler girls since then?
- A. I would speak to Alania every once in a while. When I say every once in a while, every couple of years now. I spoke to her right -- I don't know whether she called me or I called her right after the shooting with Alex. And, you know, we talked about it. And she said, I can't believe it, you know, just normal conversation. Because we were both in shock. And -- but I would touch base with her every so often. For years I was getting something from Hannah's annuity every end of the year, and I would have to call and get Hannah's address and write it down and mail it to her.
 - Q. You are talking about money or just documents?
- A. No, it was just a document. I don't know what it was. I didn't open it because it was not mine at that point.
- Q. Okay. Pull up Defendant's Exhibit 71. All right.

 Do you recognize this document?

- 1 A. I do.
- Q. Okay. And who's Angela Plyler?
- 3 A. That was Hannah and Alania Plyler's mother.
 - Q. And --

THE COURT: Is this going to take a little while?

6 We are getting towards the lunchtime. If it's going to be

7 | brief, I would like to finish it.

8 MR. AUSTIN: I can finish this document real quickly

9 and then we can move on and take a break.

- 10 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- 11 Q. This is a Certificate of Fairness and
- 12 Reasonableness, settlement wrongful death and survival
- 13 action. And the important part right here, so it says: The
- 14 beneficiaries, as represented by the named party herein,
- 15 Russell Laffitte, is fair, reasonable, and in the best
- 16 interest of the estate of Angela Lynn Plyler.
- So were you representing -- are you that
- 18 representative that's referenced in this statement?
- 19 A. Yeah. They are representing that I would be a fair
- 20 and reasonable -- you know, I would be a good representative
- 21 for Angela.
- 22 Q. And who signed down below?
- A. Ronnie, Ronnie Crosby is here. That's Alex
- 24 | Murdaugh's signature, though it looks like Ronnie Crosby's
- 25 | name line.

```
And -- but were Ronnie Crosby and Alex Murdaugh
         Q.
1
 2
     involved in that case?
              They were.
 3
         Α.
              And when you became conservator or PR here, did you
 4
         Ο.
     believe that they were your attorneys?
 5
              I did.
         Α.
 6
              And we've talked about Hannah's conservatorship.
 7
         Ο.
     Did you steal any money from Alania's conservatorship?
 8
              Steal money?
         Α.
         Q.
              Yes.
10
         Α.
              Absolutely not.
11
              Did you make any loans?
         Q.
12
              Not from Alania's.
         Α.
1.3
              Okay. And you didn't steal any money from Hannah,
         Q.
14
     right?
15
              I didn't steal any money from anybody.
16
         Α.
              Did you help anybody steal any money?
17
         Q.
              Not intentionally. I did absolutely
         Α.
18
     unintentionally.
19
              Okay. So you don't deny any of the basic facts in
20
     this case. You just are saying that you did not intend to
2.1
     help anybody steal?
22
              That's correct.
23
         Α.
              MR. AUSTIN: Probably a good point.
24
              THE COURT: Let's take a lunch break.
                                                       It will be
25
```

```
about an hour.
 1
 2
              (Jury leaves open court at 12:53 p.m.)
              THE COURT: Okay. You may be seated. Any matters
 3
     that the Government needs for me to address?
 4
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Nothing from the Government, Your
 5
     Honor.
 6
              MR. DANIEL: Nothing from the defense.
 7
              THE COURT: Be at ease for an hour.
 8
              (Whereupon, a recess transpired.)
 9
              THE COURT: Any matters we need to address?
10
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: None from the Government, Your
11
     Honor.
12
              THE COURT: From the defense?
1.3
              MR. AUSTIN: No, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: Bring in the jury.
15
              (Whereupon, the jury returns to open court at 2:03
16
17
     p.m.)
              THE COURT: Please be seated. Mr. Austin, please
18
     continue your direct.
19
              MR. AUSTIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
2.1
              All right. Mr. Laffitte, right before lunch we were
22
     talking about the Plyler sisters. And just circle back real
23
     quick. You never took any loans from Alania's account; is
2.4
     that right?
25
```

- 1 A. That is correct.
- Q. And why was that?
- A. She turned 18 before we ever did the first loan, which was in July of 2011.
- Q. Okay. And did Hannah lose any money over the course of her conservatorship?
- 7 A. No, sir.

- Q. In fact, you made her money; is that right?
- 9 A. Yes, sir, we did.
- Q. Now, let's turn to Donna and Arthur Badger. How did
 you become involved in Donna Badger's case?
- A. Alex Murdaugh came over or called me and asked me if

 I would be PR for Donna Badger. She had been killed in a

 tragic accident involving a UPS truck in Allendale County.
- Q. Did you know the Badgers prior to this?
- 16 A. I did not.
- MR. AUSTIN: Can we please pull up Government's
- 18 Exhibit 218D and E.
- 19 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. Okay. Left-hand side here, Arthur Badger is removed via this document on February 8th, 2013; is that correct, as
- 22 PR?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Do you know why he had to be removed as personal representative?

```
I heard from earlier testimony, I believe it was
         Α.
1
 2
     from Ronnie Crosby --
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Your Honor, I just want to point
 3
     out, he said February 8th, 2013, but these records show the
 4
     14th of September, 2012.
 5
              MR. AUSTIN: I was just reading the date right here.
 6
              THE COURT: So noted.
 7
              MS. LIMEHOUSE:
 8
                              Okay.
              THE WITNESS: Earlier, Ronnie Crosby had testified
 9
     that they would get --
10
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor.
11
     testifying based on another witness's testimony.
12
              THE COURT: Only if he knows himself.
1.3
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
14
              Do you have any independent understanding of why
15
         Q.
     Arthur Badger could not be a PR?
16
         Α.
              Why he could not be a PR? No, I do not.
17
              Okay. Then on the right side here, please tell me
18
         Q.
     about this document. Is this just the statement, resignation
19
     for Arthur Badger?
20
              Yes, sir, there's his resignation as personal
2.1
22
     representative.
              All right. And then is this when you became
23
     involved in the case?
2.4
              That's correct.
         Α.
25
```

```
All right. So let's go to 218F, please. All right.
        Q.
1
2
    So if you could please tell the Court what's going on here
   with this document?
```

- It's just a verification that -- my understanding, it's just a verification that says that Alex Murdaugh would have brought and had me sign.
 - Okay. And is that Alex's signature at the bottom? Ο.
- Yes, sir, I think -- I believe so.
 - Okay. And do you remember signing this? 0.
- I don't. Α. 10

4

5

6

7

- Q. You had never met either of the Badgers before? 11
- No, sir. 12 Α.
- Let's go to Government's Exhibit 23, please. Do you 1.3 0. recognize this document? 14
- Α. I do now. It's a disbursement sheet for Arthur 15 Badger. 16
- Okay. Did you ever serve as personal representative 17 Ο. for Arthur Badger? 18
- I did not. 19
- MR. AUSTIN: Okay. Let's zoom in, please, the 20 personal representative line. 2.1
- BY MR. AUSTIN: 22
- All right. See where it says Russell Laffitte, 23 personal representative fee, \$35,000. You said you've never 2.4 seen this document before everything happened with this case; 25

1 is that right?

4

5

6

7

8

15

- 2 A. I believe the first time that I saw it was in Jeanne 3 Seckinger's office when we were doing research.
 - Q. Do you have any idea why it would say Russell Laffitte as personal representative for Arthur Badger?
 - A. No, sir, I don't.
 - Q. And did you have any involvement in drafting this document?
- A. No, sir.
- MR. AUSTIN: And could we zoom out, please. Could
 we zoom in bottom three lines.
- 12 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. All right. You see where it says Palmetto State

 Bank payment to fund structure per client request, and the

\$1.325 million we heard a lot about?

- 16 A. I do.
- O. Does Palmetto State Bank do structured settlements?
- 18 A. No, sir.
- 19 O. Has the bank ever done structured settlements?
- A. No, sir, I don't -- I'm not sure what you would have to do to even do a structured settlement.
- Q. Okay. And is it your understanding that PMPED does structured settlements fairly often in their practice?
- 24 A. They do.
- Q. Would you expect that they might know that Palmetto

- 1 | State doesn't do structured settlements?
- 2 A. I would safely say they would know that we do not do structured settlements.
 - Q. You don't know for sure, but it's never happened to your knowledge?
- 6 A. No, sir.

- Q. Okay. Okay. Did you ever get paid any fees from 8 Donna Badger's estate?
- 9 A. I got a \$35,000 check, but that came from the -- now 10 we see it came from the Arthur Badger settlement.
- 11 Q. What did you think when you got that?
- A. I just thought it was the agreed-upon fee. When

 Alex asked me if I would be PR, he told me they would pay me

 \$35,000. And so I didn't -- I wasn't shocked when I got it.
- Q. Okay. And did you ask any questions?
- 16 A. I didn't.
- Q. Why is that?
- 18 A. Because I was expecting it. I knew that we had 19 agreed to that.
- Q. All right. And you said you think the first time
 you saw that sheet was at Jeanne Seckinger's?
- 22 A. I believe so.
- 23 Q. And that would have been in September 2021?
- 24 A. Probably October or November.
- 25 Q. Okay.

- 1 A. October, it would have definitely been in October.
 - Q. Did you have any role in setting that fee at all?
 - A. No, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

19

20

2.1

- Q. All right. Let's go to Government's Exhibit 37.

 And this is an e-mail we've seen a lot. The jury has already seen it. So can you tell the jury what you thought when you received this e-mail? Do you remember?
 - A. I don't remember exactly what I thought, but I know I would have been -- you know, I would have thought, why is he sending me this? But, you know, just knowing Alex, nothing surprises me. And I just -- because I would have said, why didn't he just call Jeanne or whoever to re-cut whatever check he wants re-cut for himself. But I did realize right there that I needed to give him the number for what he owed on the Hannah Plyler loans.
- Q. Okay. And was that alarming to you at all?
- A. No, it was not. I did not know what the check was
 for or anything about the check.
 - Q. All right. And you said that you had not seen that disbursement sheet that listed the 1.325 million on it for Arthur Badger?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So did this number here, again, same number 1325, did that have any significance to you at the time?
- 25 A. It does not.

```
MR. AUSTIN: And can we zoom out, please.

BY MR. AUSTIN:
```

- Q. Is Arthur Badger referenced in this e-mail chain?
- 4 A. He is not.

- Q. And did you recognize that check number, 43162?
- 6 A. I did not.
- 7 Q. And did you ever receive a check for \$1.325 million?
- 8 A. I did not.
- 9 Q. So let's go real quick -- why did you think that
 10 Alex was getting \$1.325 million at the time?
- 11 A. I really didn't think about it. You know, there's

 12 no telling what he's doing. I didn't know whether he was

 13 borrowing money from somebody else or -- you know, I just had

 14 no idea as to why he had a check for a million 325.
- Q. And this is in February. So this is after the bonus checks typically go out?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- Q. But did you have any suspicions with regard to Alex at that time?
- 20 A. I did not.

22

- Q. All right. And he was making, you said, average
- 23 A. That is correct.

\$1.5 million a year?

Q. And when you eventually did see this e-mail,
obviously, you saw it when you wrote it, but years down the

road in Jeanne's office, what did you think?

- A. When I saw this, I didn't see this e-mail in

 Jeanne's office. I was doing research. And I was

 actually -- I found it in one of the loan files of the

 Plylers. And when I found this e-mail, I printed it, because

 I had to figure out how much he owed. And I did my

 calculations and all on the actual e-mail. And I just stuck

 it in there. And when I found it, I gave it to SLED, and I

 said -- can I say that in court?
- 10 Q. How did you feel at the time?
- A. I felt -- I wanted to -- I'm trying to think how to

 put it nicely, politely. I realized what it looked like.

 And I realized how it implicated me. And I was nauseous,

 furious, and every other emotion that you could imagine went

 through me just that quick.
 - Q. Who were you mad at?
 - A. Alex, I mean, he set me up, right there.
- 18 Q. Okay. And you sent an e-mail to Jeanne after this;
 19 is that right?
- 20 A. I did.

1

16

- 21 Q. And why did you do that?
- A. He had asked me to figure it out and whatever the
 amount I owe Hannah, and he asked me to e-mail him back. I
 didn't know why he wanted me to e-mail him. So I e-mailed
 him back, but I did know Jeanne -- I added the part in about

```
Jeanne, because I knew Jeanne cut all the checks for the law
firm. And I think I mistyped and wrote "the Jeanne" to
re-cut the checks. And I gave the four amounts, 388,687.50,
whatever it was, I think it was 151 and some change, 75,000
and the 709.

Q. Okay. And did you end up writing these checks for
him?
```

- A. I wrote -- what do you mean "write"?
- Q. Okay. So you asked Jeanne to write these checks.

 And then did Alex ever come to you with re-cut checks?
- A. He did. He brought in three checks, \$388,687.50,

 the 151 that went to Hannah Plyler, and the 75,000 that went

 to Randolph Murdaugh.
- Q. So you never received four checks from him in one bundle?
- 16 A. Never.

- 17 Q. And let's go -- so this is --
- 18 A. I --
- 19 Q. I'm sorry?
- 20 A. I'm also not sure that I received all three at one time.
- Q. And we've heard previous testimony already about how they were spaced out over coming months and almost to a year; is that right?
- A. He did. He would hold them or, I don't know, piggy

- bank them somewhere, his desk drawer. I don't know what he 1 would do with them, but he would just sort of bring them in, 2 I guess so you would forget about it and wouldn't think about 3 it. I really don't know what he did.
 - All right. You see these numbers down here; do you recognize those?
 - RAM000147? Α.

5

6

7

8

20

2.4

- Do you know what those signify?
- I assume that means Ralph (sic) Alexander Murdaugh and Randolph -- whatever his name is, Randolph Alexander 10 Murdaugh. 11
- This is not the e-mail that you produced to PMPED? 12 0.
- No, it is not. Α. 1.3
- You did produce the e-mail but this is just a Q. 14 printed copy of it? Is that what you are saying? 15
- That is -- I believe this one came off of the --Α. 16 from the law firm, either from us, but it didn't come -- that 17 was not what I provided SLED. 18
- Q. Okay. So the jury has seen this one. 19
- I'm sorry. Let's go to Government's Exhibit 39. Excuse me. 2.1

Government put it up. Let's go to Government's Exhibit 29.

- Are these your notes? 22
- Α. Those are. This is the e-mail that I pulled out of 23 my file and I turned over to SLED. It shows the breakdown.
- Do you see where I wrote the 151? And then you see my 25

- calculations down at the bottom and you also see the calculations for the two loans that were paid off.
 - Q. Okay. So how do you know that this e-mail you provided to SLED?
 - A. I remember giving it to them.
- Q. Okay. And -- but when you gave it to them, did you give them a hard copy or did you scan it and e-mail it to them?
- 9 A. I don't remember that. If I had to take a guess, I
 10 scanned it and sent it to David Williams.
- 11 Q. Okay. Do you have a scanner in your office?
- 12 A. I did.

4

- Q. And is that how you would upload a lot of the documents you found through your research?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And do you see at the bottom here, it will have the RAM Bates number?
- 18 A. That's correct.
- MR. AUSTIN: So let's go to the Badger checks,
- 20 Government's Exhibit 29, please. If we can zoom in on the
- 21 checks.
- 22 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. All right. When you look at this, on the left side
- 24 you will see these initials there; are those yourself?
- 25 A. They are.

- Q. And did you write those initials?
- 2 A. I did. I wrote them when I was doing the research.
- 3 | I wanted whoever looked at this research to know who signed
- 4 | the checks. So when I was doing it, I just would write my
- 5 | initials, because I actually went and viewed the actual check
- 6 | itself. And I wanted them to know that Russell Lucius
- 7 | Laffitte, RLL, was the signer of the check.
 - Q. How can you tell that these initials came at the time you were providing this document over to PMPED or SLED?
- 10 A. Because they are in blue and not -- I would write
- 11 everything in blue so if you scanned it, you actually could
- 12 | see the blue ink versus if it was done when we originally did
- 13 it, it would be black as the image is.
- 14 MR. AUSTIN: Zoom out, please. Zoom in on the
- 15 bottom check.

- 16 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- 17 Q. Is that what you are talking about, has some black
- 18 and white there?
- 19 A. That's correct. That's a picture of when it runs
- 20 | through the machine. It images the front and the back.
- Q. So just like Government's Exhibit 39, there's a
- 22 | color scan, you can tell them apart because of the colors?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- 24 Q. All right. Do you know why Alex would be paying
- 25 | Johnnie Parker \$388,000?

- A. He would borrow money regularly from either Mr.

 Parker or his father. I mean, that was not an unusual and

 not an unknown fact to me.
 - Q. And does Johnnie Parker loan money out routinely?
 - A. He does. I mean, he's financed houses and everything else for people at the law firm. That is not an uncommon practice for him.
 - Q. And you've taken a loan from him?
 - A. I have.

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

- Q. I believe there's some testimony from Ronnie Crosby that he didn't get a break. When you borrowed money from him, did you get any kind of break?
- A. No, sir, normal rate.
- Q. All right. How many checks do you receive each day, just ballpark, as a banker in Palmetto State Bank?
- A. I don't have any idea how many checks the bank receives a day. I would say a thousand or more. I would look at probably anywhere from 50 to 100. You know, depends on the day. You know, A Friday or a Monday, it could be a lot busier. People are coming in to get money orders and we have to have an officer sign it. And me being the officer on the lobby, I've signed a lot of them. And if somebody had a problem with a check, a lot of times they would just come directly to me because, again, I'm sitting in the lobby.

MR. AUSTIN: Can we zoom back in on the check,

1 bottom left, please.

BY MR. AUSTIN:

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. So, do you remember actually receiving this check?
- A. I don't remember actually receiving it at this point. I remember when I looked at it, I knew I did it. I saw that I did it. I did the transaction.
 - Q. Okay. You don't deny that in any way?
 - A. No, sir, I did every one of the transactions.
- Q. Would it be strange just in your normal day-to-day work life to receive a check like this to Palmetto State Bank from a client asking you to do something with it and purchase a money order?
- A. No, if you want to get a money order or make a loan payment or anything else, you make the check to Palmetto

 State Bank, that would not be unusual in itself. Looking back on this check, there's some unusual irregularities, but we didn't see at the time.
- Q. Do you recall whether you saw Arthur Badger's name in the memo line?
- A. I wouldn't have looked at the memo line. The memo line is for the writer of the check to remember what they wrote the check for and, you know, if I would have seen this, I would have -- because I've had a lot of time to think about these. I mean, I would have thought something like, you know, maybe they wrote it to remember that he got maybe in

- advance on the fees from Badger or something along those lines. I wouldn't have connected it.
 - Q. Is that something that would happen with Alex from time to time?
 - A. You know, I don't know whether he did. I'm assuming he would have told me something. He would have come in with a story. And that's just the way he was. And you know, now, 2021, 2022, we see it. You know, 2011, '12, '13, '14, '15, when all this was taking place, we never suspected it.
- Q. Did you ever intend to steal \$388,000 from Arthur Badger?
- A. I didn't steal it. Mr. Murdaugh stole it. And no, sir, I would not have been in any part of it if I would have known.
- Q. All right. And you were not a fiduciary for Arthur Badger; is that right?
- 17 A. No, sir, I was not.
- 18 Q. Let's go to page 2, please. And do you recognize 19 this check?
- 20 A. I do.

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

- Q. When did you see it? When do you recall seeing it for the first time?
 - A. He brought that in to pay the loans on Hannah Plyler as on that e-mail he had asked me about. I sent it back to him.

- Q. But do you actually remember when he did bring it in physically?
 - A. I don't remember. But just seeing the date, it says 2/12/2013, so I'm assuming that was the date I did the transaction.
 - Q. And same deal with the last one, did it stand out to you that that Arthur Badger's name was on there, it was to Palmetto State Bank?
 - A. It did not. And I actually have copies of a lot of these checks in the probate file.
 - Q. Okay. And why is that?
 - A. Well, I didn't keep every one, but if I got a payment, I wanted to keep a record of how they paid it so you could go back and look and see and there would be the check.
 - Q. And we touched on this really briefly, but I think it bears repeating. You found that e-mail, the re-cutting e-mail for lack of a better term, in Hannah Plyler's account, or not account, but in her file; is that right?
- 19 A. That's correct.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. And why would you put that in her file?
 - A. Because that was where I calculated her payoff on the loan and I just -- I guess I threw it in there with this check. And it was just sitting in it because it was in the loan part section of the probate -- well, not the -- the loan section of my file of Hannah Plyler.

- Q. All right. And this goes back to -- did you think
 that there was anything wrong with your involvement in these
 checks?
 - A. I did not.

- Q. Is that why you filed them in probate court?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Let's go to the next page, please. And is this the deposit slip?
- 9 A. That is the deposit slip. I want to say one thing 10 about it.
- 11 Q. Sure.
- A. I should have cut a money order. When the check

 came to Palmetto State Bank, I should have cut a money order

 to the Hannah Plyler conservatorship. And I didn't feel like

 cutting a money order, so I just had them run it through.
- 16 Q. Is there any significance to that?
- A. Well, it was the bank's money, because it was made
 to Palmetto State Bank, even though we knew what it was going
 for because he told me what it was going for. So that way, I
 should have -- to make it clean, I should have done it the
 other way.
- MR. AUSTIN: Okay. Let's go to the next page,
 please. Zoom in on the top. Do all four of the images,
 please.
- 25 BY MR. AUSTIN:

- 1 Q. All right. And we've got initials again?
- 2 A. That's correct.

5

6

7

8

- Q. Are those just like the other initials we saw?
- A. They were. I put them on during research.
 - Q. And throughout, this is a pretty long exhibit, throughout the entire exhibit there are a number of initials that we saw in court here and they are all in blue like that?
 - A. That's right.
 - Q. Does that apply to all of them?
- 10 A. It does.
- Q. And all of these checks, we don't need to go through
 every single one, but did you know that any of them were
 stolen -- would effectively help Alex steal funds from Arthur
 Badger?
 - A. I would not have helped him in any way steal funds.
- Q. And as bad as these memo lines look, your testimony is that you don't remember seeing it?
- A. I don't. And I wouldn't have looked at the memo
 line. I mean, I saw a lot of checks. I mean, and I write
 things in my memo lines in my personal checks, but I wouldn't
 expect anybody to look at it.
- MR. AUSTIN: Okay. Let's go to page 4 please. Zoom
 in on the four images.
- 24 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. All right. What do you see here? Does this fall in

- 1 | the same lines as the other ones?
- 2 A. It is, \$75,000 money order.
 - Q. And who is this made payable to?
- A. Randolph Murdaugh III, which is Alex's father. I'm assuming he paid him for something, a loan.
 - Q. Did he tell you what that was for?
- 7 A. No, sir.

- Q. All right. Did you ask?
- A. No, sir, I wouldn't have asked.
- 10 Q. Why wouldn't you?
- A. I've been dealing with Alex for 30 years, I just
 wouldn't have -- there was no need to. The check was made to
- 13 | Palmetto State Bank. He was an authorized signer of Peters
- 14 Murdaugh Parker. He could direct how that money went. I
- wouldn't have thought anything of it.
- Q. An important point, he's an authorized signer. Can you explain the significance of that term?
- A. You see signature down here, the authorized signer
 can sign the check and direct where it goes. I mean, he was
 a partner in this law firm.
- Q. And so that gave him the authority to direct the money anywhere?
- 23 A. I would think so, yes, sir.
- 24 Q. Is that your understanding at the time?
- 25 A. That's my understanding.

```
Okay. Let's go to page 5. All right. This is a
         Q.
1
 2
     little different. We've got initials here just like the
     other ones. And, obviously, they are substantial sums.
 3
     the bottom says, estate of Donna Badger.
 4
              MR. AUSTIN: And can we zoom in on the bottom check,
 5
     bottom two checks, the image on the left and right of the
 6
 7
     very bottom.
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
 8
              Okay. So this says estate of Donna Badger, and
     $101,000, and just like the other checks, it's going to
10
     Palmetto State Bank. And did Donna Badger's estate have
11
     $101,000 in it?
12
              No, sir.
         Α.
1.3
              How much did it have in it?
         Q.
14
15
         Α.
              500.
         Q.
              500?
16
         Α.
              500.
17
         Q.
              And you were the PR for her estate?
18
         Α.
              I was.
19
              And you didn't notice this?
20
         Q.
              I did not.
         Α.
2.1
              Okay. If you had, what would you have thought?
22
         Q.
              I would have thought it was pretty odd that there's
23
         Α.
     a check coming to us with the estate of Donna Badger. But
24
```

like I said, I would have probably asked him, hey, why does

- it say this? Because I know he doesn't have 5 -- but -- but,
 you know, I would have had to have known that it was this
 money, which I wouldn't have -- like I said, I would have
 thought he was getting advance on fees. I don't know what I
- Q. Okay. And if it truly was for her estate, would that check have cleared?
 - A. It wasn't going to be from her estate. I mean, couldn't have been.
- Q. Again, you would have noticed it because of that reason, right?
- 12 A. Yes, sir, I believe so.

really thought.

5

- MR. AUSTIN: All right. Let's go to next page,

 please. I'm sorry. Let's keep going. Go to the next one,

 please. I'm going to keep scrolling until I get to Southern

 Crane. I forgot to write the page number down. Let me zoom

 in on the top two inches.
- 18 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. We've heard a lot about loans not on system. Can you put this -- can you describe what that means and the significance of it to the jury?
- A. Loans not on system is a general ledger account.

 Palmetto State Bank at one point in time was having some

 issues. I mean, we make loans, something might get tied up

 or, you know, we need to account for our money, all of our

money orders that are outstanding and everything. And this is typically how you fund a loan, is a money order or a wire. So we put wires and money orders in this account. But what was happening is we were -- continually, our money order account would show up on our nonsufficient list, because a loan's here waiting to be booked, let's just say a million dollars, the money order goes through, the money order account is not going to sit there with a million dollars. So we needed to fix that. So we came up with this idea. I believe I was the one that actually came up with the idea, with the help of some other people, that we made this account so we could clear money orders immediately. So that would fund the money order account. So if I did a loan, I would -or a wire, you know, that would pay for the money order, that loans-not-on-system account.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. And who images the loans-not-on-system account?
- 17 A. Jay Gray Peeples in the Estill branch, he manages
 18 that account.
 - Q. Is there one account for the entire bank?
 - A. There's not. There's an account for each branch. This number right here 1017569, the 69 indicates our branch number. That is the Hampton branch; 70 is Bluffton; 85 Estill; and so on and so forth for all seven branches. So we knew exactly where to look for it. And so you have to be able to keep up with it.

- Q. Loans not on systems kind of sounds weird if you are not involved in banking. Is there anything nefarious or is it any sort of attempt to hide things?
 - A. Not at all.

- Q. Within the bank, people know what that means?
- 6 A. Absolutely.
- Q. All right. And you touched on it. Wires go through the LNOS down here, loans not on system, account?
- 9 A. They did. The wires were down out of our Bluffton 10 office. And they would actually get the -- fund the wire.
- 11 Like, if I was sending wire to Southern Crane, I fund loans
- 12 not on system with the money, and they would debit it to pay
- 13 for the wire.
- MR. AUSTIN: Okay. Can we zoom out, please. Can we zoom in on the bottom check too.
- 16 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. All right. Again, this is estate of Donna Badger.
- 18 | Could her estate have ever funded a \$50,000 check?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- 20 Q. As a PR, you would have known that?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 Q. Yet, it made it through?
- A. Well, we didn't think it was Donna Badger's money.
- 24 We thought it was Alex's.
- MR. AUSTIN: All right. Go to the next page,

- 1 please. Go one more. Keep going. Right here.
- 2 BY MR. AUSTIN:

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Edward Smith, who is that?
- A. I have no idea.
 - Q. Have you come to know who Edward Smith is?
 - A. This is going to be an assumption from what I've learned, but I'm assuming Edward Smith is the C.E. Smith that you will see in his checking account that he wrote numerous checks to.
 - Q. Okay. And so you've never met C.E. Smith, Edward Smith, the Cousin Eddie I think a lot of people call him?
 - A. I am not going to say I've never met him. He had numerous lawyer loans with the bank. So he has been in my office. I would make -- I rarely made lawyer loans; however, if everybody else was busy or Carrie Sauls was the lady that mainly did those loans for us, if she would have been busy and he came in, I would have done it, but I don't ever recall meeting him.
 - Q. Okay. So did you intentionally send \$800 to buy a Jeep for Eddie Smith knowing it was stolen money?
 - A. No, sir, I did not.
 - Q. All right. And the last two checks went to Bank of America out of the Badgers' accounts. Did you ever see those checks at the time?
- 25 A. I did not.

- Q. Okay. And did you have anything to do with those funds, it's 101,000 and 50,000, approximately, any knowledge they were stolen and that Badger was out any money?
- A. I didn't know what they were until we were doing research. I never knew anything about this money that was coming in from Arthur Badger until we did the research. When I say "we," I did -- I'm sure I did a lot of it. I'm sure John Peters, who y'all met earlier, did a lot. I mean, we were all -- it was a crazy time for us and the PMPED law firm trying to research and get stuff. We were getting subpoenas from everybody and trying to get all this information.
- Q. You are talking about the research you did in the fall of 2021?
- A. That's right.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. So you all were working with the law firm trying to figure everything out?
 - A. The law firm, ODC, attorneys that are suing the law firm and Palmetto State Bank.
 - Q. And you are working with John Peters, you mentioned; anybody else at the bank to do any research?
 - A. I know my sister Gray Henderson did some. I would think just about a little bit of people did a little bit of everything. I would -- absolutely safe to say, Nancy Drawdy, she would have done the loan side, because she runs our loan department. And definitely, like I said, John Peters, Mark

- 1 | Altman, if we needed to get old images, because we were
- 2 trying to pull up images from 2011, '09. You know, they are
- 3 | not sitting there. We are having to go and physically load
- 4 | old disks or CDs or tape. I am not exactly sure which one it
- 5 is. I should know, but I don't. But they would actually
- 6 | have to physically go load them, bring them up on the system
- 7 | to get that images from that long ago.
- 8 Q. So you are doing this research not by yourself? You
- 9 | are doing it with a whole team of people?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. So it wasn't a secret to anybody at Palmetto State
- 12 Bank?
- 13 A. No, sir.
- Q. Y'all didn't know -- or did you know the full extent
- 15 of what Alex had done at that time?
- 16 A. We did not at the time. And I'm not sure we still
- 17 do.
- 18 Q. All right. So in that initial e-mail, the
- 19 re-cutting e-mail, there's a \$709,000 check, or he had asked
- 20 | for one to be cut. Did you ever receive that check?
- 21 A. Did not.
- 22 \ Q. And do you know what happened to that check?
- 23 A. You know, when I sent that e-mail, when I was doing
- 24 research and getting ready for all of this, I was like, you
- 25 know, I didn't get a \$709,000 check. And then, you know, you

- look and you break it down, all those different checks, I 1 don't think you want to pull them up and go through all of 2 them, and then you see. But on there, the law firm's general 3 ledger, journal, whatever that was put up here, you can see 4 where it was voided. I don't know who authorized the voiding 5 of it. I can tell you I did not. And then there were a 6 bunch of checks that came out of that, like 9 or 10 or so. 7 And then you see two more checks that were voided that I did 8 not authorize. Those ended up being the Bank of America
 - Q. All right. So, originally, there was going to be -1.325 was going to be split into four different checks or
 money orders or whatever?
- 14 A. That's correct.

checks.

10

11

12

1.3

15

16

17

18

19

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. And then the 709 got split up into even more checks?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Can we pull up Government's Exhibit 31. Do you recognize this document?
 - A. It's a Palmetto State Bank's stop payment order.
- 20 Q. All right. Did you have anything to do with this?
 - A. Never saw it until all of this discovery and research with this case.
 - Q. You mentioned the general ledger at PMPED and the voided checks on that. Did you have anything to do with the voiding of those checks?

A. Did not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Okay. Was it a surprise when you found out that there were all these voided checks?
- A. It really did. But, you know, now looking back on it, it doesn't surprise me at all, because that's -- if he had walked in with that million 325, I don't know that I would have recognized it. I would have recognized it as matching what that e-mail said, because it would have been just right then. But by separating it out, it was just a way for him to hide it.
- Q. Okay. And, again, did you try to help anybody steal money?
- A. No, sir, I did not.
- 14 Q. And Alex Murdaugh in particular?
- 15 A. I wasn't going to help anybody steal money.
- Q. All right. Let's move on to Natasha Thomas. How did you get involved in her conservatorship?
 - A. Just like the other ones, Alex contacted me and gave me a brief rundown, just like he would have on all of them.

 He would give me a brief summary of the case, you know, said, hey, there's a terrible car wreck and these victims were all from Yemassee area. And, you know, give me -- tell me what was going on. And just said that he needed me to serve as conservator and they asked me if I would and I told him I would.

- Q. And did he get a lot of clients from the Yemassee area?
 - A. He got a lot of clients from all over, but, yes, he did. I mean, he did a couple of them. He had a knack for getting some really good, big cases.
 - Q. Can you elaborate a little bit more on that?
 - A. I was always under the understanding that, you know, he would give -- like, if law enforcement sent a case to him, I wouldn't say they really sent it, but if I had gotten in an accident and they are asking who do I need to talk to, they might would say call Alex Murdaugh. And I basically was told he would give them like a finder's fee or something.
- Q. You don't know that for sure? You don't have independent knowledge of that?
- 15 A. No, sir.
- Q. And did you ever meet Natasha Thomas?
- 17 A. I did.
- 18 Q. Where did you meet her?
- 19 A. I would have met her at the mediation.
- Q. Okay. And would Alex have been there; do you
- 21 remember?

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

- 22 A. Yes, sir, he would have been.
- MR. AUSTIN: Let's pull up Government's Exhibit 110.
- 24 All right. Let's go to page 3, please.
- 25 BY MR. AUSTIN:

- 1 Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 2 A. I do. It's the renunciation of rights.
- Q. I'm sorry?
- 4 A. It's the renunciation of right and waiver of bond.
- Q. And this is what cleared the way for you to become conservator?
- 7 A. That's correct.
- 8 MR. AUSTIN: And let's go to the next page, please.
- 9 Next page.
- 10 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- 11 Q. All right. And this is petition, just like some
- 12 others we've seen already. Were you responsible for filling
- out any of the information on this page?
- 14 A. No, sir, I was not.
- 15 Q. Who filled that out?
- A. Alex Murdaugh or PMPED. I would assume that one of
- 17 his paralegals would have filled it out for him.
- 18 Q. You heard testimony about the age being incorrect on
- 19 this?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- 21 Q. Did you have anything to do with writing in age?
- 22 A. Absolutely not.
- 23 Q. And you never met Natasha Thomas before?
- 24 A. No, sir.
- 25 MR. AUSTIN: And if we can go to the next page,

```
please. I'm sorry. Go to the third page.

BY MR. AUSTIN:

Q. Yet you signed it?

A. I did.
```

- Q. In the verification portion at the top, why did you sign there?
 - A. That's where I was told to sign, so I signed there.
 - Q. And so you didn't know what her actual age was at the time?
- 10 A. I never met her. I mean --

8

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. And why didn't you get out -- make sure you got her driver's license and verify all the information?
 - A. Just like everything else, hindsight, I wish I had. I would have had to drive down to Yemassee and found her and gone and met with them and gotten the actual age. But we didn't fill out these forms. Yes, I signed them. Yes, I signed the verification. But I did not verify that she was 15 years old.
 - Q. Okay. And it says -- if we can zoom in on the verification -- says the facts set forth in the foregoing statement are true to the best of undersigned's knowledge, information, and belief; is that true?
 - A. That's right. I mean, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it was correct at the time. From what they filled out and told me, I would assume that it's correct.

```
And you still signed it. Were you just relying on
         Q.
1
 2
     Alex?
              I was -- yes, sir.
 3
         Α.
              MR. AUSTIN: Okay. Zoom out.
 4
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
 5
              And, again, but your understanding was that you were
 6
     accepting the appointment to become her conservator at the
 7
     time?
 8
              That's correct.
         Α.
              MR. AUSTIN: And let's go to Government's Exhibit
10
     20. If we can zoom in on the fee portion.
11
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
12
              Did you ever receive a $15,000 conservator fee?
1.3
         Ο.
         Α.
              I did.
14
              But did you do any work for her?
15
         Q.
              I helped them set up the structure and that was
         Α.
16
     about it.
17
              All right.
         Q.
18
         Α.
              That was it.
19
              I'm sorry?
20
         Q.
              I said that was it, I set up the structure.
2.1
              And we talked about structured settlements before.
22
     Is there much work that went into this one similar to what
23
     you described earlier?
2.4
            No, there's not a lot of work. And it seems like a
25
```

- large fee until you are sitting here in the situation I am
 right now and you see the civil side of it, the civil
 liability that you are taking on for that fee. But, no, I
 did not do that. Attorney and I went to a mediation or two,
 and I'm sure I've got a bunch of lawyers, letters from
- Q. All right. How do you decide what kind of structured settlement to buy?

lawyers, and helped set up the structured settlement.

- A. You listen to the advice of lawyers. And Forge Consulting was who they would always use.
- Q. Again, Palmetto State Bank did not have the ability to do structured settlements?
- 13 A. Not at all.

6

10

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- 14 Q. Let's zoom out.
- 15 A. Of the structure, \$650,000.
 - Q. All right. Let's zoom in on the disbursement to client. There you go. All right. Disbursement to client; you see Natasha Thomas, Palmetto State Bank, \$325,000. Do you know, did Palmetto State Bank receive \$325,000?
 - A. We did not. Well, you know, that's a tough one to answer. We did not knowingly receive it. It was just like Arthur Badger, he came in with this check made out to Palmetto State Bank, told me where he needed it to go, and I did the transaction for him. So I guess, you know, in theory, the bank did receive it. In reality, we did not know

- what we were receiving. We thought we were receiving money that he had.
 - Q. Okay. And can we go to Government's Exhibit 21.
 Okay. And what is that \$25,000 Palmetto State Bank loan?
 - A. I don't know the loan, but I know the check now that we've seen it and done it. And this one was the one that we broke up into several 9,000, 9,500, whatever the numbers were. We've seen it multiple times. That's what that check was.
 - Q. You said "we" broke it up, this has come up at other points --
- A. We, we -- whenever we talk about Palmetto State

 Bank, there's no -- as I know y'all have heard it, there's no

 I in team, it's always "we." I couldn't cash a check as a

 PR. I couldn't cash a check as an individual. I guess I

 could, a small one, but I couldn't cash a big check. So when

 I say "we," we as in Palmetto State Bank, me as an employee

 of Palmetto State Bank, that's what I mean.
 - Q. And you heard your sister Gray talk about what that means at the bank?
- 21 A. Right.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

19

- Q. And that's something your dad has talked to you about?
- A. That's correct. I mean, just like any -- I'm going to use a football team as an analogy. Yeah, you might have a

```
superstar, but it takes the others to win a game. And that's
 1
     the same way at any business. You know, you are going to
 2
     have your high performers, you are going to have some that
 3
     you pulled along. But it takes all, you are a team. You've
 4
     got to be together. If you are not together, then you have
 5
     problems.
 6
              Is that core philosophy at Palmetto State Bank?
 7
         Q.
              Absolutely.
 8
         Α.
              Is that something that you attribute the bank's
         0.
     success to over multiple generations of Laffittes?
10
         Α.
              I do.
11
              Your dad, how many brothers did he have, your dad?
12
              Oh, you thought you were talking -- I have one
13
         Α.
     brother. My dad has two, two brothers. One has passed away
14
```

- But they all -- they all worked as bankers together? Q.
- They did. Α. 17

now.

15

- I'm around lawyers all the time, so used to saying 18 Q. "practice." 19
- Did you steal any money from Natasha Thomas? 20
- I did not. 2.1 Α.
- MR. AUSTIN: All right. Zoom out. 22
- BY MR. AUSTIN: 23
- Okay. Did you ever help Alex steal knowing that he 24 Q. was stealing money? 25

- I would not have done that. Α. 1
 - All right. Let's turn to Hakeem Pinckney. Let's go to exhibit -- Government's Exhibit 109. Go to page 9. All right. I know it's getting repetitive. We've got to work our way through. And we are almost done. Do you remember this, when you were appointed to be his conservator?
 - I do. Α.

3

4

5

6

7

8

15

19

20

2.1

23

2.4

- And like the previous form, did you fill out any of the information in this document?
- I did not. Α. 10
- Q. And do you know who did? 11
- PMPED, Alex Murdaugh, or one of their employees. 12 Α.
- Let's go to the third page, please. Okay. 1.3 0. again, says Pamela Pinckney renouncing her rights? 14
 - Α. That's correct. That was his mother.
- Did you know when Hakeem Pinckney died? Q. 16
- I did not. Α. 17
- And had you ever met him before? 18 Q.
- Α. I had not. He was very seriously injured in this wreck and was a quadriplegic. I want to say he was in North Augusta or Augusta in a nursing home. I wouldn't swear to that, but he was in a home. 22
 - And let's go to -- well, I guess there's previous testimony about an e-mail where Alex texted you or e-mailed and said, 911, please call me. Do you remember getting that

from him?

1.3

2.1

2.4

- A. I saw that in discovery. And I have no idea what that -- you know, I have no clue why he sent that. But I would have called him. I mean, if he sent me that, I would have absolutely have picked up the phone and called him.
 - Q. And he didn't bring up Hakeem Pinckney?
 - A. I don't recall anything about it.
- Q. All right. Let's go to Government's Exhibit 21, please. All right.
 - A. Didn't we just look at this one?
- Q. All right. So did you try to pay any of the money back to Malik Williams -- I mean, Hakeem Pinckney that was taken by Alex Murdaugh?
- A. Oh, Hakeem Pinckney, after I did the research with Hakeem Pinckney and Natasha Thomas, it was just like on the Badger, I mean, you just wanted to throw up when you saw what truly had transacted when you had that -- you know, when you've got that hindsight and you could see what's going on. And I met with Mark Ball and several of them. And I also met with my father. And I wanted us to settle or try to settle, just like we had done with Arthur Badger. So when I met with them, they had said that they weren't -- they were not going to even consider paying any of it. And so I went back to the bank and, you know, 634,000, plus the 25,000, so 659, \$660,000, and I went to them and I said, let's pay it, let's

```
get out of this. And we definitely were not going to write a
 1
 2
     check like we did, even though we had the authority that was
     -- caused a big hoopla before. So we would take it to the
 3
     Board. We had already sent an e-mail to the attorney and
 4
     explaining to him what was going on, what we wanted to do.
 5
     And when we got to our Board meeting, the day we got to the
 6
     Board meeting to discuss it, we were served with the notice
 7
     of intent to sue.
 8
              MR. AUSTIN: Okay. Could we pull up Government's
     Exhibit 22, please.
10
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
11
              Do you recognize this disbursement sheet?
         0.
12
              I do.
         Α.
1.3
              And zoom in on the fees, please. Did you receive
         Q.
14
     $60,000 conservator fee?
15
         Α.
              T did.
16
              And did you do any work for Hakeem Pinckney?
17
         Q.
         Α.
              I helped set up the structure just like before, go
18
     to the mediation.
19
20
         Q.
              Okay.
              Not -- you know, that was probably too much of a fee
2.1
     now, looking back.
22
         Q.
              All right. Let's go down to the disbursement to
23
     client, and 309,000 to Palmetto State Bank. Do you recall
2.4
     that coming through?
25
```

- I do not. Now, looking back, I know where it came Α. 1 through on doing the research. But one thing I want to say 2 here, I was the conservator, not Palmetto State Bank. If you 3 look at the top of the one behind you, it says clearly 4 Russell Laffitte. And on the settlement statement or 5 disbursement statement it shows Palmetto State Bank. And I 6 believe that's how that was -- that was the start of the 7 theft because he would write it to Palmetto State Bank 8 knowing we wouldn't recognize it. If it came in Russell Laffitte as conservator, we wouldn't be sitting here today. 10
- Q. And you didn't have anything to do with drafting this disbursement sheet?
 - A. No, sir, I did not.
 - Q. Did you sign off on it?
- 15 A. I did.

1.3

14

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- Q. Why did you if it had that Palmetto State Bank there?
 - A. He would come in, just like I said earlier, he would have it marked, he would send a runner or he himself would come in and say, I need you to sign here. Years, decades of trust and experience and took advantage of you, of me.
 - Q. All right. Now, moving on to Malik Williams, how did you get involved as conservator for him?
 - A. Paul Detrick asked me to be conservator for him.
- Q. Who is Paul Detrick?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Who is Paul Detrick?
- A. He was a partner. He's passed away now. He was a partner at PMPED.
- Q. All right. So how did Alex get involved with that case?
- A. He was not involved at all with the case. But, you know, they are in a building together. So they know what's going on on different cases.
- 10 Q. And he was a partner?
- 11 A. Yes, sir, they were both partners.
- 12 O. Alex and Detrick?
- 13 A. And Paul.
- 14 Q. And how many lawyers did the firm have at the time?
- 15 A. In the Hampton office at that time, 10 maybe.
- Q. Okay. And that was a pretty big fee that he got from that case, wasn't it?
- 18 A. Yes, sir. Well, on Malik Williams?
- 19 Q. Sure.
- 20 A. I don't think it was that big, but it was --
- Q. Okay. Let's go to Government's Exhibit 108 and go to page 3. All right. So is this letter asking you to be,
- or the petition, for you to be appointed as conservator?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- Q. And let's go to the next page. Next page. All

- 1 | right. And this is -- do you recognize this letter?
- 2 A. I know what it is. It was a letter done to Peters
 3 Murdaugh Parker from the probate.
- Q. Let's go to page 9, please. I believe this is the last one.
- 6 A. Right. That's the appointment.
- Q. Okay. It's the same form you've seen before. And did you have anything to do with filling out any of this information?
- 10 A. I did not.
- MR. AUSTIN: Let's go to the third page, please. Go
 back one. Sorry. All right. There we go.
- 13 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- Q. And this one is a little bit different than the other ones. Can we zoom in on the top third. All right.
- Has Paul Detrick sign -- I guess that's Paul Detrick. Do you recognize the signature?
- A. I don't recognize the signature, but I'm going to assume that also.
- Q. But this one appears to be filled out correctly;
 does that look right?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Zoom out. And on the verification here, you don't have your signature?
- 25 A. That's correct.

- 1 Q. Is that Paul Detrick's?
- 2 A. I'm going to assume it's the same as above, so, yes,
- 3 sir.
- 4 MR. AUSTIN: Zoom out, please. Zoom in on the
- 5 bottom part.
- 6 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- 7 Q. All right. So here, this is your signature; isn't
- 8 it?
- A. That is mine.
- 10 Q. All right. And you don't know how Alex got involved
- in this, but somehow he found out, is that what you are
- 12 saying?
- A. I mean, it's a small office. They are going to
- 14 talk. They know about cases. I mean, he very well could
- 15 | have -- Paul could have said -- been down in the lunchroom
- 16 or --
- MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor, this is
- 18 | complete speculation.
- 19 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 20 BY MR. AUSTIN:
- 21 Q. Let's just wrap this up. Did you ever intentionally
- 22 try to help Alex or anybody else steal from Malik Williams?
- 23 A. No. No, sir.
- 24 Q. All right. So I just want to talk real briefly
- 25 about Palmetto State Bank Board. When did you first join the

1 Board?

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

- 2 A. Somewhere -- I don't remember exactly, but I would 3 probably say between 2005, 2010.
 - Q. Okay. So was there sort of an older generation still in leadership at the bank at that time?
 - A. Absolutely.
 - Q. And who was in leadership at the bank?
 - A. My father, Charlie Laffitte, was chairman and CEO.

 We had Mark Laffitte. He was in Estill. He was -- I don't remember what his title was, chairman something. But he was more like vice chairman. And Monty Laffitte out of Bluffton was vice chairman. Henry Laffitte in Allendale, he was the -- he was executive vice president. He ran the branches up there. Jan Malinowski, and that's about it.
 - Q. Okay. And there's been testimony about newer family members joining the Board in the past few years; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. How would you just generally describe the Board's approach just when you were coming up in the bank --
- 21 MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection. I think this is going to 22 go towards some of Your Honor's prior rulings.
- 23 THE COURT: I'm listening.
- MR. AUSTIN: I'm trying hard to stay away. I have no intention to go there.

BY MR. AUSTIN:

1.3

- Q. Was there a different approach to handling issues from the older generation?
- A. Absolutely. The older generation, they would sit around and they would talk about it, they were done. That was it. We didn't have as many formal meetings. Yes, we had our formal Executive Committee meeting on the second Tuesday of the month. Yes, they had their formal Board meeting, but if there was something in between, they would pick up the telephone and call and they'd work it out and they would add it to the minutes or vice-versa.

And 2021, we were struggling with that changing over from having strict, formal -- strictly, you know, more informal to a strictly formal setting. You know, you are doing things, here's how you do it, when you do it, and everything else.

- Q. So the bank was trying to formalize their procedures more and not be quite so -- I guess it's a family, conversational in handling things --
- MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor, he's testifying.
- 22 THE COURT: I believe you are testifying.
- MR. AUSTIN: I felt it. Sorry. I didn't mean to.
- 24 THE COURT: Just ask a question. You can't lead the 25 witness.

```
MR. AUSTIN: I'm watching the clock and trying to
 1
 2
    move along.
              THE COURT: Well, let's get it right.
 3
              MR. AUSTIN: Yes, sir.
 4
    BY MR. AUSTIN:
 5
              So was it something -- was it a priority of yours to
 6
 7
     formalize the procedures?
              I wanted it to be a lot -- just do loans. I
 8
     wanted -- we needed to grow loans. We were one of the
     lowest, or at the time in 2021, we were I think about second
10
    or third lowest in the state of South Carolina in loans to
11
    deposits. We needed loans. And we were trying to grow
12
            And to grow loans, you've got to go out there and get
1.3
     loans.
     them --
14
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance.
15
              THE COURT: I'm not sure where this is going.
16
              MR. AUSTIN: I think we've made our point. So I
17
    will keep going.
18
    BY MR. AUSTIN:
19
              So let's go to Government's Exhibit 6. If we could,
20
    please go to -- I need glasses, I'm realizing more and more.
2.1
     The very bottom here it says that the loans outstanding of
22
23
    Richard Alexander Murdaugh were discussed. The copies
    attached. What's going on there? What's that mean to you?
2.4
              This is August 17th, 2021. And so we had had an
         Α.
25
```

- 1 Executive Committee meeting, according to the minutes, on
- 2 | August 12th. And it discussed Alex Murdaugh's -- all of his
- 3 | loans. Obviously, we had a Board member send an e-mail
- 4 | wanting to get a list of it. So I presented a list of all
- 5 | loans and everything else so we could talk about it.
- 6 MR. AUSTIN: All right. Let's go to page 2. And
- 7 | zoom in, please, on the second paragraph. Thank you.
- 8 BY MR. AUSTIN:
 - Q. All right. Tell us what's going on here.
- 10 A. This is just a summary that said, Charlie Laffitte,
- 11 | Chairman Laffitte, reviewed all the loans of Alex Murdaugh.
- 12 And I was saying that his intention was to sell the farm and
- 13 that we had mortgage on the properties that supersede the
- 14 property being transferred into Maggie's name. That was
- 15 obviously in error. And that we didn't add in the
- 16 | charged-off loans. We were just explaining what took place.
- 17 And we also talked about the \$750,000 loan, because Elizabeth
- 18 | Malinowski didn't see where it was in the formal Executive
- 19 Committee.
- Q. And did you agree with her assessment of that
- 21 | \$750,000 loan process?
- 22 A. Of the -- that it did not go through the formal
- 23 | Executive Committee? Yes, I did.
- Q. You did agree?
- 25 A. Yes, I explained that three of the five members

approved the loan, which in my way of thinking, you've got three of the four voting members, the loan was approved by the Executive Committee. But we did not -- on our third -- second Tuesday of the month meeting, that was not brought in to it, no, it was not.

- Q. Okay. Were you hiding that loan from anybody?
- A. Absolutely not.
 - Q. And are you familiar with Credit Leader?
- A. I am.

2.1

- Q. How do you know anything about Credit Leader?
- 11 A. I was the one that purchased the program.
- Q. All right. So what did you understand about when you purchased Credit Leader?
 - A. We were trying to be more responsive, get more —
 just, you know, get our processes in order. We were trying
 to grow the bank. And we needed a way for us to be able to
 look at loans and look at them quickly from other offices.
 So you could go in there and put it in. And, like, if
 somebody in the Bluffton office, they could type in it, scan
 in any documents they wanted to it, they could e-mail me and
 say, hey, can you look at this, and I could look at exactly
 what they are looking at right then. And just makes us be
 more responsive to our customers, which is always what you
 want to be. You know, community banks, it's not necessarily
 any cheaper than a big bank, or oftentimes it's more

- expensive than a big bank because it's more of a boutique.

 So we've got to sell ourselves on speed and responsiveness to customers.
 - Q. And what was your understanding of when you would log in to Credit Leader and enter information or do anything?
 - A. If you change anything or do anything, it logs it and tells when it was, time, date, stamp, everything.
 - Q. So you were fully aware of that when you purchased the system?
 - A. Yes, sir.

1.3

2.1

- Q. There's been a lot of talk about some of this information on the \$750,000 loan put in. Can you explain any of that?
- A. The 750,000 loan, we approved it. My father, my sister, and I approved it. As you've obviously heard numerous times, it was funded, the 350 was funded with wire in July to Chris Wilson. And then we covered -- deposited \$400,000 in a money order. A money order was cut for the \$400,000 balance of the proceeds deposited into Alex Murdaugh's account to cover his overdraft. And then we had the loan documents signed. Then we actually went in to do Credit Leader. So it had already been approved, but it was not a -- it's not memorialized until you see the August -- I think it was August 18th that shows on Credit Leader that that was the day of approval. It was approved way back

before we ever funded the wire. Otherwise, we couldn't have done -- I couldn't have done the wire, because he was so far above my lending limit. But that's when it was put into the Credit Leader.

I would have had Carrie Sauls or one of the other ladies type it in. I believe it was Carrie Sauls. I think I saw her name. And then we would have gone in -- I would have gone in after she told me she had all the documents in there and all the notes, I would have hit approve, knowing it's not been approved because it was over my lending limit. And then since I had myself, my father, and Gray Henderson, we would all, as three of the four voting members of the Executive Committee, then I went in and approved it as Executive Committee.

- Q. All right. And again, y'all were not trying to hide that loan from anybody?
 - A. No. We had already notified them about it.
- Q. When did you notify them?

1.3

2.1

- A. We talked about it in the Board meeting. I mean, in the Executive Committee meeting, and when we talked about those -- I mean, we weren't trying to hide it at all.
- Q. Your brother testified to the appraisal process starting in April; is that right?
- A. That was right. We were getting an appraisal done
 on the house. I'm not sure that's when the actual 750

started. But we knew the primary -- the first mortgage was maturing. So we knew we did it. And at some point, he had come in and said he needed some money. The actual loan started off at 500,000. And then it moved as he asked to increase it to 750, said he was doing some work and other things. And so we did it. And we assumed, as y'all would know how assuming ends with Alex Murdaugh, we assumed that the C.E. Smith that he was writing checks to every week or so, I mean, large checks, that was -- that looked to us like normal checks that you would be writing to a contractor.

And, yes, we did know that we were doing a \$750,000 loan on a house that had appraised previously at 730. So, no, we were not under the -- we didn't think it was all going to the house.

- Q. All right. And based on your understanding of what -- the way loans worked, was there any concern on your part that some of this money was not going to the stated purpose?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Why not?

1.3

2.1

A. You know, just like y'all -- somebody said in here, you know, 750 -- the original appraisal that we had at the time was 730,000. You are not going to do a \$750,000 renovation on a 7-, 8-, \$900,000 house. And that's why we were taking additional collateral. We wanted that Green

Swamp share of stock, which was worth about 230- to \$250,000.

And we knew that house was worth a lot more than 700,000. So we weren't that concerned. We felt like we would be, once we got the second mortgage in place, which, unfortunately, we never did, that we would be -- be collateralized at least dollar-for-dollar.

- Q. And did that beach house end up selling?
- A. It did, for \$955,000.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. Okay. If I'm understanding correctly, even though

 Alex was overdrawn on his account by a substantial sum, close
 to 3 --
- A. \$367,000 and some change. But we knew what the funds were for. We were in close contact -- no, we didn't know -- we thought we knew what the funds were for. We knew what he was telling us the funds were for.
- Q. And so the initial \$350,000, what was your understanding where that money was going?
- A. He asked me to -- said he needed the money, needed to send a wire to Chris Wilson. He had a lot of irons in the fire at this point in time in his life, lawsuits with the son and, you know, his wife and son had just been murdered. I really didn't question it, you know, I guess a lot because of that. You know, I really didn't ask him. Now, right after September, we knew exactly what had happened with it.
 - Q. When he came to you all asking for this loan in

July, what was his demeanor? How was he acting?

1.3

2.1

- A. He was distraught. I mean, he just lost his wife and son. It really had started before that. But when we talked to him in July, I mean, as you would expect, somebody that just lost their wife and son violently, I mean, he was real pale, you know, just seemed upset. But we knew -- we've had a long running history with him. We weren't concerned. He had a strong earning history. You know, we didn't -- we felt comfortable loaning him money when he needed it.
- Q. We've heard testimony about him not working during that time. What was your understanding?
- A. He was still receiving a paycheck. He was -- they had him go get counseling. I mean, obviously, you know, something tragic like that happens, you need to be able to talk to somebody. And I know that they wanted him to see a counselor. And I think he was just taking like -- stepping back, taking a leave, and turning some things over while he processed this and while he processed his grief and everything else.
- Q. Okay. So we fast forward to the fall. Was the Board worried about lawsuits during that time?
 - A. During July?
 - Q. In the fall.
- A. Well, we were already in a lawsuit on the Satterfield case.

Q. Okay. And without going into specifics, did you settle that case?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- We did. And that was -- going on the Badger side on Α. the 680, that's why we got -- we wanted to settle it. We, Palmetto State Bank -- I did the transactions; nobody else. I did them. When I did the research and I saw all those transactions, and I was like, you know, you know what, we've got liability. The money went through Palmetto State Bank. We had just settled a lawsuit. We didn't touch the money. And it was a lot more than \$680,000. And they also were adamant about the PR fee in the settlement. So that's why, you take the million 325 plus the 35,000, that's why we did the PR fee. And that's -- I was like, you know what, if we can get out of here for \$680,000 versus a million-plus, we were going to be on the hook on that for a million 1, because that's what truly went through us. The rest went through Bank of America. It would be a hard sell to -- hard to prove that we had any liability there. And that would be the -that's why we did that.
 - Q. You said Satterfield settled for substantially more. We don't want to hear exactly how much. But you said no money came to PSB?
 - A. None of the money flowed through any of our Palmetto State Bank or bank accounts.
 - Q. Why did you all settle it?

- A. That was under the advice of our attorney, Trenholm
 Walker, and his firm.
- MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. I believe he's going to divulge privileged communications.
- 5 BY MR. AUSTIN:

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Did you think it was in the best interest of the bank?
 - A. Absolutely.
- 9 Q. Okay. And so were you factoring that into your decision when you wrote the \$680,000 check?
- 11 A. Absolutely. I mean, I wouldn't have done it except
 12 for I knew how much we could possibly be on the hook for
 13 after dealing with Satterfield. This was substantially more,
 14 in my opinion.
 - Q. And we've heard a lot about bylaws of Palmetto State
 Bank. And what was your understanding of your authority
 under the bylaws?
 - A. I had the authority to settle, you know, make contracts, conduct business for the bank. It's not -- and I knew I had the authority. I looked at it.
- Q. And what about your dad, what authority did he have, or what was your understanding?
- A. He had the same authority. He could settle, make -do anything for the bank that was needed.
- 25 Q. Okay. And what about the Executive Committee?

A. Same thing.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. Okay. So y'all didn't discuss it with Jan Malinowski; is that correct?
 - A. We did not, not at that time.
 - Q. Did you think that you needed to?
- A. Oh, no, we didn't. I didn't think we needed to at that time. We were trying -- you know, time is of the essence. Our thoughts were, let's -- first of all, we had made a mistake. I had made a mistake. A client that thought he had money at Palmetto State Bank had lost money. We needed to make him right. That's the right thing to do.
- So I went over and made the agreement. I immediately funded it. And, you know, as soon as I funded it, I'm not sure whether it was before or during or the same time, I mean, I notified the Executive Committee on the same day we funded it, and I notified the Board the following morning.
- Q. Okay. And let's back up to October 25th. Do you recall meeting at PMPED?
- A. Was that a Monday?
- Q. I'm not sure.
- A. I was out of the state when I got the phone call about the checks of Arthur Badger. And I told -- Jeanne Seckinger called me. And I told her, Jeanne, I'm out of town. I said, no, we don't want e-mail. I said I will be

- 1 | there Monday morning to pick it up. Got a handprinted out
- 2 | list, which is in one of the exhibits, that goes through all
- 3 the checks. We immediately go back, start researching it.
- 4 As soon as we have it, you know, I take all the checks, the
- 5 copies, where it went, go back over to the law firm. By this
- 6 | time, I've already talked to my father, because when I'm
- 7 | researching, I realize, oh, my God, what is going on? Talk
- 8 | to him. I went over there and said, hey, let's split it.
- 9 And we agreed to it. Came back, cut a money order.
- 10 Q. Okay. And in the Satterfield case, Chad Westendorf
- 11 | had been the conservator in that, right?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- Q. And the bank, nonetheless, settled the case, though
- 14 he had screwed up personally?
- A. You know, I don't know whether he screwed up
- 16 personally, but it was messed up, yes.
- 17 O. Okay. That was a bad choice of words.
- 18 A. I understand.
- 19 Q. Is that part of how it works with a bank, you settle
- 20 cases sometimes?
- 21 A. Banks, businesses in general, will settle a lot of
- 22 cases because they don't want to be just splashed all over
- 23 the news, as I have been. I mean, you just -- nobody wants
- 24 | that. And you are trying to mitigate the bad press. You are
- 25 trying to mitigate losses. So you try to settle.

- Q. Okay. All right. Let's pull up Government's 1 Exhibit 12, please. I believe we've seen this already. 2 is the e-mail you are talking about where you are notifying 3 the full Board?
 - That's correct. Α.

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

- All right. And you say here, we covered this over and over, we converted 1.172, and explain everything here. Again, when you said "we converted," you weren't shifting blame, were you?
- Absolutely not. "We" is me and all of us at Palmetto State Bank. I was the actual person that did the transactions. When we say "we," it's part of Palmetto State Bank, because I couldn't have done those transactions if I was not an employee of the bank.
- Have you ever denied your involvement writing that Q. check or involved in any of the underlying checks that led to the need to do this?
- Α. No, sir.
- Okay. And why didn't you include more detail about Q. what happened?
- We were told not to. As I've told you all, we were getting subpoenas, and lawsuits are flying around, or threats of lawsuits are flying around. Our attorneys had asked us not to --
- MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. Is hearsay. 25

```
THE COURT: Sustained.
 1
              MR. AUSTIN: I don't want what anybody said.
 2
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
 3
              Okay. Let's go to Government's Exhibit 78. Is this
 4
         Q.
     the check that you delivered to PMPED?
 5
              No, that's their check.
 6
              Okay. And you did write the check to them, right?
 7
         Q.
              That's correct.
 8
         Α.
              And when was that deposited into Palmetto State
     Bank?
10
         Α.
              They deposited their -- the check, the money order,
11
     cashier's check that I took over there on the 29th of
12
     October.
1.3
         Q. Okay. So we've heard testimony about that being the
14
     date that the money is out the door and it was a done-deal.
15
     But that was not your understanding; is that right?
16
         Α.
              That's correct. That was not -- just funded the
17
     deal, but --
18
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Objection, Your Honor. He's
19
     testifying for the witness.
20
              THE COURT: Sustained.
2.1
              MR. AUSTIN: Let's go to Government's Exhibit 74,
22
     please. Let's zoom on the second e-mail there from Russell,
23
     October 28th. Right there.
2.4
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
25
```

- Q. All right. Can you explain what's going on in this e-mail here?
 - A. This is the e-mail that I sent Thursday morning when we had agreed to settle this or made the agreement to split the loss with PMPED to try to make Arthur Badger whole and try to avoid a lawsuit.
- Q. Okay. So the check was deposited the next day on the 29th, but the day before, you were letting people know about the check?
- 10 A. Yes, sir. This is -- the "to" line is the Executive
 11 Committee.
- Q. Okay. And did anybody raise concerns then and ask that you put a stop payment order on it?
- 14 A. They did not.

4

5

- Q. And then you sent the e-mail to the full Board the next day?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- Q. And why didn't you just do them both at the same time?
- 20 A. I'm not sure. I really don't know.
- Q. I'm going to show you what's marked as Government's
- 22 Exhibit -- Defendant's Exhibit 83.
- MR. AUSTIN: May I approach, Your Honor?
- 24 THE COURT: Yes.
- 25 BY MR. AUSTIN:

- 1 Q. Take a look at that. Do you recognize those checks?
- 2 A. I do.
- Q. Or that check, I should say. Did you write it?
- 4 A. I did.
- Q. And if you could, please explain, how do you
- 6 remember that check?
- A. It's \$17,500 out of my pocket. This was, if y'all
- 8 remember the Donna -- not Donna, Arthur Badger agreement
- 9 between us and the law firm, is million 325 that was stolen.
- 10 | There was \$35,000 in PR fees, million 360, we divided by two.
- 11 So Palmetto State Bank had paid \$680,000. In that \$680,000
- 12 is \$17,500 in PR fees that they did not earn, get or anything
- 13 else. I got them. So I was repaying Palmetto State Bank the
- 14 17,500.
- Q. \$680,000 figure is not entirely accurate; is that
- 16 correct?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- 18 Q. Did the bank accept this check?
- 19 A. They did. It was -- this check was written and done
- 20 on 11/1.
- 21 Q. Okay. So the first e-mail of the Executive
- 22 Committee is on October 28th. 680 check is written on the
- 23 29th. And then you wrote this on the 1st?
- 24 A. I wrote it on the 1st, but the bank did not run it
- 25 | through, as I see on the back, until December 17th. And I

```
can't answer why the difference in dates.
 1
 2
              MR. AUSTIN: All right. Your Honor, at this time we
     move Defendant's Exhibit 83 into evidence.
 3
              THE COURT: Is there an objection?
 4
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: No objection, Your Honor.
 5
                          Defendant's Exhibit 83 is admitted
              THE COURT:
 6
 7
     without objection.
              (Defendant's Exhibit 83 is received in evidence.)
 8
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
              I think you've described this already, but let's
10
     just do it real quick for the jury. Reference PR fee, half
11
     in settlement at the bottom?
12
              That's correct.
         Α.
1.3
              And this is the $17,500 you wrote to the bank?
         Q.
14
              Yes, it is.
15
         Α.
              For half of the conservator fees?
         Q.
16
              Correct.
17
         Α.
              Or PR fees. Was it part of your understanding with
18
         Q.
     Ronnie Crosby that they would pay the other half?
19
              That was correct.
20
         Α.
              That was the deal they all struck?
2.1
         Q.
              That is right.
22
              And we've heard a lot about this November 3rd
23
         Q.
     meeting of the Board. Can you describe -- and I don't want
2.4
     to talk about anything outside of just the $680,000 payment.
25
```

What was the Board's reaction at that time to the check?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

17

18

19

20

check. So we did.

A. There was a lot of discussion about it. Obviously, a lot of people were upset, I mean, as we all were.

\$680,000, that's a lot of money to just write off. And they were asking if there was any more, which we are doing research as hard as we can, trying to get -- and I'm constantly in contact with the law firm trying to get clarity, hey, we've researched all the case that we were PRs, conservators, or anything. And, you know, there was just a lot of concern. And they asked us to put a pause on the

- Q. And is that what you discussed on October 31st meeting, the pause?
- A. You know, there was so many meetings in that time,

 it's hard to go through and tell you exactly. But there was

 a pause put on the check.
 - Q. Okay. And were you concerned for your own status at the bank around that time?
 - A. I was. I had gotten an e-mail, I believe it went to the full Board, asking when I was going to resign.
- Q. And did you think that you had done anything wrong at that point?
- A. I don't think I did anything illegal. I definitely had made a mistake.
- 25 Q. And did you say as much to the Board?

- 1 A. You know, I really don't remember. I'm sure I did.
- 2 I mean, it was crazy times.
- Q. I think it's been described as damage control mode?
- 4 A. Absolutely.
- Q. And when you are at the November 3rd meeting, did you record the meeting?
 - A. I did.

8

14

15

16

- Q. And why did you do that?
- A. I really don't know. We recorded our meetings for minute purposes. And I'm not sure if my sister, who was the secretary for the Board, was going to be late or something, so I recorded it. I actually didn't realize that I had recorded it until several months ago at the latest or
 - Q. So was it your sister's practice to record Board meetings?
- 17 A. Uh-huh.
- 18 Q. You said for minute purposes?

earliest. I just -- I would record them.

- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. And then what was her practice with that?
- A. I assume she just deleted them at some point in
 time. I don't think she would do it every month, just delete
 them.
- MR. AUSTIN: Your Honor, I would like to play
 Government's Exhibit 60 -- I mean, Defense Exhibit 60.

```
MS. LIMEHOUSE: Your Honor, this exhibit is not yet
 1
 2
     in evidence.
              THE COURT: Well, let's take our afternoon break.
 3
              (Jury leaves open court at 3:29 p.m.)
 4
              THE COURT: Let me ask, I take it this is the audio
 5
    where you previously admitted the transcript; is that
 6
     correct?
 7
              MR. AUSTIN: I believe the transcript is already in,
 8
    Your Honor. I misspoke. I should have moved to enter it
     into evidence.
10
              THE COURT: Please be seated. And please be quiet.
11
              MR. AUSTIN: We were going to move it into evidence
12
    now and then publish it to the jury.
1.3
              THE COURT: Publish what to the jury?
14
              MR. AUSTIN: The audio of the record recording.
15
              THE COURT: Have you edited it down so it's
16
     consistent with the redaction?
17
              MR. AUSTIN: Yes, sir. So Defense 60 has the
18
     original part that Your Honor approved. And then we have a
19
    snippet that the Government wants included as well. We can
20
    play that. We are happy to accommodate there.
2.1
              THE COURT: Well, I'm confused. What does that
22
23
    mean?
              MR. AUSTIN: There's a little --
2.4
              THE COURT: If we are going to play it, you are not
25
```

```
going to play the Government's part at the same time, or how
 1
 2
     are you going to do that?
             MR. AUSTIN: We are prepared to. We could do it
 3
    easily. We wanted to play our part.
 4
              THE COURT: Ms. Limehouse.
 5
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Your Honor, we never heard any of
 6
 7
    these recordings before this moment. And so there's a
     transcript --
 8
              THE COURT: She's saying she hasn't heard the
     redacted version.
10
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: None of them, they've never been
11
    provided to us. We have a transcript that has been admitted
12
    into evidence.
1.3
              THE COURT: Let me ask this. Has the -- I had
14
    ordered long ago that the audio be provided. Has it not been
15
    provided?
16
              MR. AUSTIN: Obviously, it was. We wanted to
17
    everybody to hear it.
18
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: We have never received the --
19
              MR. AUSTIN: That's news to me.
20
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: We never received --
2.1
              THE COURT: Here's my concern. You know, there are
22
     complex privilege issues here. We've spent a lot of time
23
    resolving them. And what I don't want is, oops, we violate
2.4
     it. That's why you show this to the other side so they have
25
```

an ability to screen it, and if there's a problem, to raise an objection. We've been through this a lot. And I've ordered very specifically -- I believe the word was promptly in my order, promptly, provide this to the Government.

1.3

2.1

2.4

MR. AUSTIN: My understanding is that we did, but, we have no desire not to share. We were trying to get it out the whole time.

THE COURT: I'm cognizant we've given them a transcript, so you are not going to hide the thing.

MS. LIMEHOUSE: Of course. And, honestly, Your
Honor, I don't believe that you ever ordered them to turn it
over to us. They were ordered to turn it over to the
privilege holder, who was then required to provide the areas
of the recording that they were not going to assert privilege
over.

THE COURT: I don't have an ambush problem here.

MS. LIMEHOUSE: No, that's not what we are alleging, Your Honor. The problem is more so that I think this recording that we have never heard may risk confusing the jury. There's snippets of redacted portions that we haven't listened to. And we already have a transcript in evidence that says exactly what the defense wants the jury to hear. And so I think it's a waste of the jury's time. And I think it's going to risk confusing them.

MR. AUSTIN: Judge, it's a really short snippet.

```
And we could play it during the break here.
 1
              THE COURT: Let's take a break. And we will come
 2
    back, play it first for Ms. Limehouse before you play it for
 3
    me. If it's short, over the break, and then when I come
 4
    back, let me hear from Ms. Limehouse.
 5
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: Very good, Your Honor. Fair enough.
 6
              (Whereupon, recess transpired.)
 7
              THE COURT: What's the scoop?
 8
              MS. LIMEHOUSE:
                             We've now had an opportunity to
 9
     listen to the recording. Our concern is that the portions we
10
    wanted included are not coordinating in time. So what they
11
     are working on now is finding a way to include those portions
12
     the way they appear in the transcript and during the meeting.
1.3
    As long as they can present the jury in the way that those
14
     statements took place and as long as the transcript can roll
15
    with the recording, we have no objection.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. That makes a lot of sense.
17
              Now, Matt, how much longer?
18
              MR. AUSTIN: I think this part should take 10
19
20
    minutes. And then I have like two minutes of questions.
              THE COURT: What concerns me is this. How long is
2.1
22
    your cross?
23
              MS. LIMEHOUSE:
                              Long.
              THE COURT: I don't know we should start a cross.
2.4
    You know, I mean, there's a lot of detail here. You've done
25
```

```
a lot of detail. And I'm inclined to send the jury home.
1
 2
    don't think we start at 4:30 on Friday afternoon
    cross-examination. I don't think it's -- first of all, I
 3
    don't think it's fair to your client to be at the end of the
 4
    day like this. And it's not fair to the Government.
 5
     inclined to send them home and do the cross Monday morning.
 6
              Now, let me just confess, if I were in y'all's
 7
     shoes, I wouldn't want to give the Government all weekend to
 8
    work on it.
 9
              MR. DANIEL: I never thought of that, Judge.
10
              THE COURT: I wouldn't give them that much time
11
    myself.
12
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: I also just want to be clear that no
1.3
     communications over the weekend.
14
              THE COURT: No, I am not worried. We will tell him
15
     that. No, he can't talk. He's on the stand. He can't do
16
     that.
17
              MR. AUSTIN: We think we are good to go with the
18
     slice.
19
              THE COURT: Y'all got the slice?
20
              (Whereupon, the bench conference ends.)
2.1
              THE COURT: Have we resolved our differences
22
     regarding the audio? We are mutually satisfied, Ms.
23
    Limehouse?
2.4
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: I believe so, Your Honor.
25
```

```
THE COURT: Mr. Austin?
 1
              MR. AUSTIN: I believe that's right.
 2
              THE COURT: When he's finished, let me know.
 3
              MR. AUSTIN: I think we are good, Judge.
 4
              THE COURT: Bring in the jury, please.
 5
              (Whereupon, the jury returns to open court at 3:53
 6
 7
     p.m.)
              THE COURT: Please be seated. Mr. Austin, please
 8
     continue your direct examination.
 9
              MR. AUSTIN: Thank you, Your Honor. At this time,
10
     Defense would move Defendant's Exhibit 89 into evidence.
11
              THE COURT: Is there an objection?
12
                             No objection, Your Honor.
              MS. LIMEHOUSE:
1.3
              THE COURT: 89 is admitted without objection.
14
              (Defendant's Exhibit 89 received in evidence.)
15
              MR. AUSTIN: We would like to publish it to the jury
16
     and also 223, which is the transcripts, and we will play it
17
     at the same time the audio is playing.
18
              THE COURT: Any objection?
19
              MS. LIMEHOUSE: No objection.
20
              THE COURT: Very good. Please proceed, sir.
2.1
              (Audio playing.)
22
     BY MR. AUSTIN:
23
              So what was your understanding of what was going on
2.4
     there and what the Board was or was not onboard with?
25
```

- My understanding after that meeting, that we had all 1 Α. agreed to pay the \$680,000, that they were working --2 Trenholm Walker was working towards getting a release for the 3 bank from PMPED, and that we were going -- moving forward.
 - And I asked this several times through witnesses, to your knowledge, had anybody filed any written dissent to that payment?
 - Not to my knowledge.
 - And you informed the Executive Committee, not just your dad, your sister and yourself, obviously not yourself, but on the 28th, you wrote that e-mail to the Executive Committee?
 - That's correct, the full Executive Committee. Α.
 - And that includes Jan Malinowski and Scott Swain? Q.
- That's correct. 15 Α.

transaction?

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

- And he was talking about Arthur Badger at the end Q. 16 Is he, to your knowledge, a beneficiary of Donna there. 17 Badger? 18
- He is not. He renounced that. 19
- Okay. I'm going to wrap this up. With the \$500,000 20 Q. line of credit, what was your understanding of that 2.1
- We were doing a line of credit for Mr. Murdaugh. 23 And we were using his -- he had his property in Moselle, 2.4 1,700 acres, plus or minus. And we were taking a second 25

mortgage on the house and I want to say however many acres the house was actually, a couple of houses, barns, et cetera, and then a first mortgage on the rest of the property, about 8- or 900 more acres. And he was going to use it -- I think for business purposes said farming, but he was going to use it as he needed. And the first -- I am not saying it's the first advance, but one of the first advances he took 284,000 and paid off Alania -- not Alania, Hannah Plyler, the loans on the Hannah Plyler, and the rest he used lone to cover overdrafts and other things.

1.3

2.1

2.4

- Q. And did you have any concerns about the fact that it wasn't all used for farming?
- A. I had no concerns at all. I mean, we were well collateralized, the property was worth about \$3 million, if I remember correctly. And, actually, that loan was paid off within 90 to 95 the days in to a million dollar line of credit.
 - Q. Did the Board vote on approving that loan?
- A. The Board voted to approve the \$500,000. We, as a Board, voted every month on all the loans over 25,000 to approve them. And then on the million dollars, the Executive Committee took it through the Executive Committee and through the Board.
- Q. Okay. And it was asked to you about some of the conservator and PR loans earlier. You didn't have any intent

to steal from anybody or help anybody steal from anybody there?

1.3

2.1

2.4

- A. I did not. I wouldn't have been part of that.
- Q. With regard to the \$680,000 check, \$750,000 loan, \$500,000 line of credit, did you have any intention to misapply funds to the bank or hurt or injure the bank or defraud the bank?
- A. I would have been defrauding myself, seeing as I was one of the shareholders, and I would not have done it. We were trying to make on the 680. We were trying to make our client -- not our client, the client who lost his money that we facilitated part of the loss, because we did the transaction. We were trying to make the client whole. We were also -- at the same time, we were trying to make the client whole, we are trying to protect the bank and reduce our liability.

On the loans, we had no intentions of trying to defraud or mislead. I mean, those loan purposes, you know, I am not even sure who put it on the sheet, but I'm sure I instructed our loan assistant to put "farming" on there. I mean, he owned land. He did raise some timber out there on that property. I mean, it's a significant piece of property. And there was no intent to try to defraud the bank. I mean, he was making payments on it and everything.

Q. And you are talking about Moselle, that property?

- A. I want to clarify. He never made a payment on the \$750,000 loan.
 - Q. And what is your understanding of why?
 - A. Well, it was a single-pay note, so there were no payments due until January. But as we all know, he was in jail before then. So there was no way he was going to make a payment. The only payment is when we -- not we, the Murdaugh family -- sold his share of Green Swamp stock and applied it to that loan, which was \$250,000.
 - Q. Okay. And so in terms of exposure to the bank, the Moselle is under contract, right? You said that the beach house was under contract or --
 - A. It sold.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

- Q. 0 United and Red Beard, have those properties sold?
- A. They sold.
- Q. Do you know how much for?
- I did see it. I can't remember whether it was 17 Α. 900,000 or -- you know, those 0 United and Red Beard LLC, 18 they are two separate LLCs, but they were done in one 19 transaction. So it's hard to tell whether -- when I said 20 they were done in one transaction, the sale, when I saw the 2.1 sale paper in public records, I couldn't tell whether it 22 was -- I should know that amount or not, but looked to me to 23 be about 1.6 million or something like that. I might be 2.4 wrong on that. 25

MR. AUSTIN: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

1.3

2.1

2.4

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I never like to start a lengthy cross-examination or a direct late on Friday afternoon. So I'm going to send you home. I think everybody will do better first thing Monday morning. So we will resume. I want to remind you over the weekend, I don't want you looking, talking to anyone about the case, not looking at any Internet or any news articles or anything else. Keep it within you. And, of course, when it's all over, you can talk to anyone you wish and share about it. But right now, we are still within the jury family. Okay? So everyone be safe.

We will see you first thing Monday morning.

(Jury leaves open court at 4:08 p.m.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. I want to just -- so Mr. Laffitte will have good guidance here, the rule is once someone is on the witness stand, their lawyers cannot talk to them. So you are on your own. I'm sure you are not going to mind too much not talking to your lawyers this weekend. And you will probably be glad to be ordered not to do that. And so he will resume Monday morning. And over the weekend, we won't have any conversations with him. Any other matters I need to address?

MS. LIMEHOUSE: Nothing from the Government, Your Honor.

THE COURT: From the defense?

```
MR. DANIEL: Nothing from the defense, Your Honor.
 1
              THE COURT: Get good rest. We will see you Monday
 2
     in the morning.
 3
               (Whereupon, the proceedings are adjourned.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, Karen V. Andersen, Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter for the State of South Carolina at Large, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true, accurate and complete Transcript of Record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am neither related to nor counsel for any party to the cause pending or interested in the events thereof. Registered Merit Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter